THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A NEW book by Dr. F. R. BARRY, Bishop of Southwell, is sure of a good welcome. His writing is fresh and topical and popular in style, and the book under review, *Church and Leadership*,[1] has the further merit of being practical. It is the Bishop's hope that the Church will awaken to the tasks confronting her in the post-war world, and in particular show new powers of leadership. 'The opportunity is now vouchsafed to us of building anew a Christian civilization. Is there in the world enough Christianity, and good enough Christianity, to take it?'

The appeal is specially to the Church of England, about which the Bishop writes out of the fuller knowledge that years of episcopal administration have been bringing to him. He is very insistent that a new conception of pastoral work should be established. It is not enough to be shepherding those already inside the fold; the shepherd is to seek the 'other sheep' who are outside. In other words, the paramount claim is evangelism. And in the work of evangelism all the members of the Church should share. Their aim should be to send out Christian men and women trained and equipped into the secular world of the market-place, the factory, and the council-chamber, so that religious and moral leadership may be provided in the secular activities of citizenship. This is the method of 'indirect evangelism,' but it is the most direct approach to the Christianization of the common life.

The Bishop is surely right in saying that one ground for clerical *malaise*, not yet clearly realized by the laity, is the wearing struggle against poverty in the large parsonage house. He looks upon the housewives in the parsonages as the 'unsung heroines' of the Church, and expresses the hope that 'when the war is over' (a clause which the Bishop has failed to revise) he will be allowed to dedicate a new church to Martha in honour of English housewives in war-time, with a special altar set apart in commemoration of the aforesaid 'unsung heroines.'

It is a wise remark that the question of ministerial recruitment, in good enough quality and in sufficient strength, is 'number one priority' for the Church of England. The Bishop deprecates a 'clerical type,' emphasizing the need for all sorts and conditions of men; not only from the Public Schools and ancient Universities, but from the coal face, the factory or the tractor, the laboratory and the studio, the technical college and the grammar school. 'If years bring the philosophic mind, it may be that a certain experience of life is a pre-condition of effective ministry—and that not only to middle-aged people.'

It would follow that if the Church should be ready to draw from new sources, it should also be ready to adopt new methods in the training of the ministry. This raises the question of the future of the theological colleges, which exercise a dominant influence upon the clergy and, through them, upon the Church. It is a curious situation, but not wholly indefensible, remarks the Bishop, that the colleges are independent ventures, owned and administered by their own trustees. He would, however, like to see the colleges more closely linked with the Universities, ancient and modern, though he would not insist on a rigid rule that all clergy in future must be graduates. After all, he could hardly with consistency do so, in view of the new sources he would draw from in the recruitment of the ministry.

The discussions of the book are by no means confined to domestic issues confronting the Church of England; they carry the reader into wider and more general fields, examining questions of leadership in thought, in worship, and in social service. Let us consider certain aspects of the question of leadership in thought.

In Dr. BARRY'S view the churches have paid an 'appalling' price for their neglect of theology, and any political or social leadership the Church can offer to the post-war world depends upon theological recovery. Happily the intellectual initiative is passing back to Christian theology. And the first and urgent need of the Church is to seek

[1] S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net.

higher standards in preaching. 'By and large, the radical weakness of preaching to-day is its triviality. It has been forgetting how to speak the great language. The sermon to-day is too easily degraded into a few bright topical remarks, or mild advice about minor aspects of personal piety or religious deportment. But this is not preaching as the Church knows it.'

But our author does not let us forget that he has 'liberal' sympathies in theology. He does not defend the older liberalism, which was fundamentally anthropocentric—concerned with man's attitude to God rather than God's activity towards man. But he holds that only liberal thinking in the true sense can save theology from obscurantism. Theology must not become a thing apart, 'a specialization with a ring-fence round it,' as is at the moment the prevailing tendency. 'The so-called theology of crisis marks such a violent and exclusive contrast between the all-sufficiency of God and the failure and fallibility of man, that it ends by denying any place for God in the "natural" goodness of men and women (in abrupt contradiction to the Parables) or in the advancing knowledge of mind and conscience.'

It is not 'dogmatic' theology that Dr. BARRY would condemn. It is theology that is at once 'dogmatic' and unrelated to the culture of the age. The 'liberal' emphasis must be recovered. If we want to know how theology can be at once 'dogmatic' and 'liberal,' we are referred to any of the books by the late Archbishop of Canterbury or by Professor Leonard Hodgson (and yet how different their standpoints!). These writers seek, as Dr. BARRY would say, to build up a coherent Christian view of the world, related not only to what is past but to what God is doing in the present; but it is a task demanding the collaboration of all the churches.

Under the title of *The Significance of the Cross* [1] Professor F. W. DILLISTONE of Wycliffe College, Toronto, has published lectures he gave in the spring of 1942 to ministers on the subject of 'Preaching the Atonement.' The stress of war, he felt, brought back into everyday use the words and symbols associated with Calvary. In that great event of the Cross the Christian faith sees the act of God restoring to Himself the human life sundered from Him by sin. How can we make the meaning of this more vivid to our minds and to our fellows in the contemporary scene? This is the question answered in this book.

[1] Lutterworth Press; 12s. 6d. net.

The New Testament witness and material are considered at length in the first four chapters. There the Cross and its fruits are set forth in four concepts (or 'metaphors')—redemption and salvation, judgment and justification, consecration and communion, forgiveness and reconciliation. What can we do by way of interpretation and elucidation of this witness? Professor DILLISTONE leaves largely aside the answers given in the classical theological doctrines. For his purpose he proposes what he calls 'the method of imaginative comparison' which he describes thus: 'to feel and see resemblances between typical happenings in human life and the great act accomplished by Christ on the Cross.' Simply stated this appears to mean that we try to get across to the New Testament 'metaphors' by the use of another set of 'metaphors.'

Where then shall 'the imagination' operate? There are four regions of life offering to it the illuminating material. There is first the struggle of life, man's battle with enemies without and within; second the order of community with its ideas of law, justice, penalty; third there is the sphere of culture with its drama of creativity; and lastly we have the realm of the home, the sphere where love can suffer and overcome. Drawing upon the resources of these fields one by one we can present meaningfully the work of Christ. We can set our themes forth thus: the Cross as Redemptive Conflict, the Cross as Righteous Judgment, the Cross as Perfect and Dynamic Example, the Cross as Forgiving Love. By this method of approach we can show the values for to-day in the basic Christian affirmations.

It is a sound principle to seek within the near and familiar things of life what may help us across to the fuller grasp of the Divine doings in Christ. 'Imaginative comparison' is perhaps a needlessly cumbrous name for this. But, in any case, following this method Professor DILLISTONE has given a very interesting exposition, and written a warm-hearted book. His writing is enriched with a great wealth of literary references and vivid illustrations. Homiletically it is very rewarding. The author knows full well that men are not saved by doctrine or explanations but by the wholeness of Christ's life and message, the joy and sorrow of it, laying hold personally upon their wonder, love, and praise.

We have the feeling, however, that many of Professor DILLISTONE's readers—even the grateful ones—will have some difficulty with his method.

He may have asked more of it than it can give. When he travels from the sphere of man's justice he repeats, as if they were now clarified, the Anselmic words 'reparation' and 'satisfaction'; he speaks of Jesus 'identified' with the human race and owning its 'debt'; elsewhere he finds, in the words of Macleod Campbell, 'Jesus offering a perfect confession' of our sins. The traditional meaning of these words in theology is one thing; what the modern analogies here used mean is different. Our difficulty is that in this book there is an over-easy assumption that these meanings confirm each other. In short Professor DILLISTONE'S method is excellent as a preface to theology. The preface, however, will not justify us in taking Aulén, Anselm, Campbell, Forsyth and building out of certain passages from them a 'composite' picture which we name the Atonement. This also bears upon the New Testament. There is more there than 'metaphors' which we can get at by other and contemporary 'metaphors.' Behind words like 'Christ conquering the demons,' 'Christ enduring the condemnation of the law,' 'Christ being made sin,' there lies a metaphysic of God, of the Divine Will, of the world-order, of the constitution of man. We are not obliged to take over that metaphysic when we gladly rejoice in Jesus as Redeemer. Indeed it is a primary part of theology's task to sift that metaphysic, and in some of its features to reject it. Upon this, as much as on anything else, the welfare of preaching depends in an age when traditional terms have become opaque and irrelevant for so many.

Reconciliation and Reality.

III. The Reconciliation of the Sexes.

By Principal William Robinson, M.A., D.D., Professor of Christian Doctrine in the Selly Oak Colleges.

In a penetrating book, *The Science of Power*, by Banjamin Kidd, which ran into nine editions between 1918–20, but which, even so, has not received the attention it deserved, the author concluded with a 'Chart of Human Progress' in which he set out the differences between the 'lower or individual stage of human evolution' (Darwinian) and the 'higher or social stage.' In the former he had the characteristic 'the capacity of the fighting male' contrasted with 'the mind of woman' in the latter. This was followed by 'the spirit of aggressive war' in the former and 'the spirit of the child-mind' in the latter. Here was a penetration which was rooted deep in Christianity, and which went to show that the reconciliation of man with woman is as important for civilization as the reconciliation of class with class and race with race. It touched a fundamental sore spot which has been in every order of civilization that has existed. What, then, has Christianity to say about this matter?

Few people realize how vitally Christianity is connected with the status of women in society. This is due partly to the fact that few have the historical equipment to appreciate the change which was wrought by Christianity in the first two centuries—one might say, revolution; and partly to the 'blind spot' which has been created in most of our eyes by the 'lag' which has occurred in Church practice in implementing the full Christian teaching on the matter. The Church has hung on to certain primitive patterns in which formerly the truth was working itself out, and attempted to preserve them as history has moved on.

Under the *pax Romana* woman had achieved a certain dignity of status giving her a measure of independence. But this was, in the main, confined to the patrician class, and it was almost purely a legal status and not richly centred in *personal* needs and realities. Christianity brought a different flavour into it and extended it to apply to all classes of people, even slaves. It is not an accident that the Gospels contain stories which tell of the free and equal relationship of Jesus with women. No such stories in Greek literature have precisely their flavour. In the Gospels such stories are introduced with a naturalness which is all their own. They do not suggest that anything wonderful is happening. This very naturalness is apt to deceive us into thinking that it was a very ordinary thing. But it was not an ordinary thing. The naturalness is simply a fitting literary embodiment of the fact that it was natural *for Jesus* to be thus friendly with women. The stories, too, whilst devoid of any sense of

'male superiority,' are also devoid of any sense of 'female inferiority' which may manifest itself as unnatural 'masculinity.' Jesus had the quality of being 'neutral' with women, so that His friendship with them was on the same basis as His friendship with men.

This attitude was also, in a large measure, characteristic of St. Paul, who had many such companionships with women.[1] We must remember also that it is in the Gospel of Luke that the stories of our Lord's friendship with women are most prominent, and Luke was the companion of Paul. For many people who are guilty of a *sentimental* attachment to the campaign for 'women's rights,' St. Paul is the arch-offender. They see him as a kind of woman-hater, full of dreadful sex inhibitions which make him a veritable monster. The modern age has produced a long line of such protagonists. Most of them are lacking in knowledge and, having imbibed a few catchwords belonging to the jargon of modern psychology, they apply them indiscriminately. Few of them have ever taken the trouble to study St. Paul seriously. All this mountain of abuse is based on a few isolated passages in the letters of a busy missionary, some of them of doubtful authenticity,[2] to the ignoring of all else. It is almost incredible that any intelligent person should have been deceived by it. The facts are that St. Paul had constant fellowship with women missionaries who worked with him. He had the most profound admiration for their talents, and a natural relationship with them which is parallel to that of Jesus. Of course, in the pursuit of his task as a missionary, he often had to fall below the level of what he conceived to be the ideal, when he was faced with situations which were so complex that there was no way out which would not have been a worse evil, except the laying down of a 'rule' which would meet the situation for the time being. This was the case when dealing with the situation of prostitution which had invaded the Corinthian Church. It is the way every missionary has to go to work to-day. It is the only way anyone can work *in history*. But to imagine that for all time Christian women were to be prevented from entering a place of worship without headgear, because certain brazen women claimed the right to appear in the Christian assembly flaunting the guise of an evil trade, is to mistake a 'rule' for a principle and to do serious injustice to St. Paul himself. Their liberty was licence, but we have turned true liberty into bondage. In the same way we must deal with every other missionary situation, interpreting it in the light of the facts which create it, and not exalting its 'rules' into regulations for all time.

From this foundation in actual *concrete reality*, and not in sentimental notions, the Church proceeded to dogma. St. Paul enunciated the dogma when he declared, 'in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female.' What this means has only been dimly apprehended down the ages, even by the Church herself; and while she has done much for the liberation of women, more than any other institution, there is still much to be done. The dimness of comprehension has been of two kinds. Not only has there been failure to grant equality to women, but there has been a tendency to understand the dogma at a shallow, instead of at a deep, level.[3] Many have fought for an understanding as if St. Paul had said there was no difference between men and women. Such can have had little experience of either! Besides, this would make nonsense of the text; for unless there were essential differences the statement would be nonsense. Perhaps there is only one thing worse than a masculine woman and that is an effeminate man. We shall need to look more deeply into the matter.

The Christian dogma has other foundations than the attitude of our Lord to women, followed so closely by St. Paul. Its roots are to be found in the Old Testament. 'So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; *male and female created he them.*' Here is a statement of almost pure equality, the foundation of that attitude which forbids treating women as if they were the goods and chattels of men. But, it will be objected, there is another creation story in which woman is made to be inferior, in that she is thought of as made from the rib of a man. Note, in the first place, that this primitive story makes it quite clear that woman was made for *fellowship* with man, and fellowship is a *mutual* thing. Madame Raissa Maritain, the Russian wife of Jacques Maritain, has even suggested that this story can be interpreted so as to turn the tables on man's notion of superiority! She would claim that it declares that woman had a nobler origin than man: 'She was not made from the earth, from "the dust of the earth" like man . . . she was made of human stuff, created in the heart of paradise, while man only entered therein after his creation.'[4] This may sound a little too

[1] See Ro 16 and many incidental passages in Acts and his letters.

[2] *E.g.* 1 Co $14^{34, 35}$ which is most probably a marginal note incorporated into the text by a later hand, and the basis of 1 Ti $2^{11, 12}$. The Pastorals are most likely Pauline in substance, but not in detail. The real Pauline attitude is expressed in 1 Co 11^{11} and Gal 3^{28}.

[3] See what I have said, in the footnote on p. 22 of *Christian Marriage* (James Clarke & Co., Ltd.), about man being the head of the woman.

[4] *Histoire d'Abraham*, quoted in *True Humanism*, by Jacques Maritain, p. 192.

ingenious for most folk, and she may be reading into the story more than is actually there, but perhaps not more than *we ought to get out of it.* But, it will be further objected, does not the Hebrew story put the blame for sin on woman? So the story has been interpreted, and we all know Tertullian's ravings on this matter. But, in passing, we may remind ourselves that St. Paul said, 'By one *man* sin entered into the world'; and, if it be argued that he was using 'man' in the generic sense, he certainly is not putting the blame on *woman.* But the story may be interpreted quite differently. It may be justly claimed that it shows the nobility of woman. Man plays but a sorry part in the story, especially in his craven attitude in putting the whole blame on woman. Here again Madame Maritain has something suggestive to say: 'Thus, according to the Bible, the physical origin of woman is nobler than that of man. The price of this privilege is that the claims of God and of man are by so much the higher with regard to her. . . . It is Eve who took, by her fault indeed, but also in the hardihood of decision which is proper to an adult, took the initiative which, accepted by Adam, decided the fate of humanity. . . . For the same reason God has permitted the laws which man has made, either by himself or under His inspiration, always to demand a greater humility, abnegation and purity from woman. The traces, the memory of his animal and earthly stage, press more heavily on man. But Eve is full of resemblances to the better Adam.'[1] Those who have insight will see that the story not only enshrines a foundation for the equality of woman with man, but that it enshrines the paradox of 'equality with difference'; and they will see embedded in it a difference which makes chivalry an essential quality of every order of civilization. In this respect we must not forget that already there has appeared the sign of a very different kind of civilization, which will either degrade woman to the level of an almost forgotten past, or give her a fictitious exaltation to an inhuman level in which all elements of chivalry will be swept aside. She would then occupy a position of equality with man, minus all the graces with which she is now adorned, and would be little other than a monster.

What has been said so far will be met by objections from two quarters. First, it will be objected to by many Christians who take a *static* view of Christianity, and, discovering that in the primitive Christian community there were very real inequalities, wish to impose this as a pattern upon the Church for all time. Secondly, it will be objected to by those who are opponents of Christianity and wish to deride it. These people, themselves, will be strong advocates of 'equality without difference,' that is of equality of *function* as well as of *status*, holding a very elementary view of personality to the extent of denying its actual existence in differentiated forms of sex and race, and will consider themselves to be very advanced in their views. Really, their advanced character consists in their being merely *views*, or abstractions away from the 'is-ness' of things as they really are. They, too, will point to conditions of inequality in the primitive Christian community and to the continued character of inequality in the Church (especially with regard to the Ministry),[2] taking these things to be of the essence of Christianity rather than as a pattern belonging to the 'accidents' of the temporal situation.

In both cases what is lacking is a clear understanding of *history* and the way in which it works. In the first case it is a denial of the *livingness* of history, in the sense of claiming that what has once appeared in history as an actual pattern must be preserved, not in essence, not analogically (as Aquinas argued), but in very detail. Those who take this point of view are in constant danger of so idealizing the past as to 'create a past which never was a present.'[3] In the other case it is a

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[2] On the question of women finding a vocation in the Ministry, the Church has held differing positions at different times. There can be little doubt that women were admitted to the order of Deacons in most primitive times and the New Testament implies even more, that they acted as Missionaries or Evangelists, besides which there were certainly women Prophets. The Montanist revival of women Prophets was certainly a revival of something primitive. With the advent of Monasticism, shut out from the major orders, they found a vocation in the life of contemplation. At the time of the Reformation, Protestantism found no place for them, taking, as it did, the primitive pattern for the essence of things. Quakerism gave them equal status and equal functions with men, as did the Salvation Army later. More recently they have been admitted to full status as Ministers in some Baptist and Congregational Churches and to the lay-Eldership in the Presbyterian Church of England. In one section of the Dutch Reformed Church they are ordained as Ministers, but act only in the capacity of Curates. In the Western (Roman) Church they have always been permitted to administer Baptism in extreme cases, as can be done by any layman. The hesitancy to allow them full status as Ministers and to admit that they have Ministerial functions is due to regarding history statically, and taking the primitive pattern as a fundamental principle. Often it is due to allowing an acquired prejudice to create a primitive pattern which never had any existence, to creating 'a past which never was a present.' History is often read backwards in this way. My own view is that there is nothing inherent in the place of woman in the New Israel to prevent her exercising full Ministerial functions. There are, of course, practical difficulties, apart altogether from inherent prejudices, such as those relating to marriage and the bearing of children.

[3] A phrase which I owe to Principal A. M. Fairbairn. This attitude is most clearly seen in the Christian

denial of the 'given-ness' of history.[1] These 'idealists' refuse to recognize that history is a *concrete* thing, and that it is impossible to weave patterns in the air and to impose them on actual historical reality. All one can do is to set a 'leaven' to work and await the 'ripe time' or the 'fulfilled time.'

It is at the point of marriage and sex matters that the Church and the Law in Christian countries has most seriously misunderstood the status of women, though it must never be forgotten that the Church has done more than any other institution to raise the status of women in marriage. St. Paul recognized a functional difference which is a reality we neglect at our peril; but at the same time he recognized an unparalleled identity in love.[2] This identity was of a concrete and personal order, not of an abstract and bloodless order. Christian marriage is no legal contract, nor does it involve mystic absorption. It involves the interpenetration of personality without loss of identity, and it ought to be equalitarian so far as men and women are concerned. The vows taken by the man and the woman should be identical.[3] In Christian marriage a man and a woman enter into a love relationship. In such a relationship such notions as 'rights' and 'duties' are transcended. Marriage is also a social custom which must be regulated by the State. In this country the Civil Law on the matter is largely based on Canon Law,[4] and there are points in which it still lags behind in the matter of complete equality between man and woman, especially on matters of property and some matters relating to separation and divorce, which have not been completely equalized by the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1937. We should also be in a better position if Civil Marriage were made compulsory for all, to be followed by Christian Marriage only by those who were definitely Christian and desired to take the Christian vows.

Behind all that I have said there lies the hidden mystery of the true order of eternal reality; for God Himself is fellowship. The 'old Israel' was described as 'the bride of Yahweh' and the 'new Israel' is described as 'the bride of Christ.' The assertion of this mystical reality sets a dignity on woman which has often been overlooked, as indeed 'nuptial theology' was sadly corrupted after the time of St. Augustine, and has been sadly neglected in modern times.[5] As the bride of Christ the Church already has an earnest (*arrhabōn*) of that 'identity with difference' with Him, which is the essence of fellowship and differs entirely from 'identity of sameness,' which is the aim of most oriental religions. It is this truth which must be applied to the relationship of men and women and which must find its expression in the concrete forms of history. In the new World Order there should be opportunity of giving it clearer expression. It will mean that, whilst we are bound to recognize difference of function, there must be no difference of status. The matter of inequality must disappear from our thinking and from our practice.

literature of the first four centuries, where a Greek static view of history was substituted for the Hebrew dynamic view of history, especially in the pseud-epigraphic literature.

[1] Even Karl Marx said, 'Man makes history, but under conditions which are determined.' Both halves of this formula have at times been ignored by Marxists.

[2] See especially 1 Co 11^{11}, where he says, 'Howbeit neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord.'

[3] In most modern Service Books the vows now are identical, including the 1928 Prayer Book.

[4] See *What is Christian Marriage?*, by Arthur Tarleton Macmillan (Macmillan & Co.).

[5] See *The Bride of Christ*, by Claude Chavasse (The Religious Book Club).

Literature.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

The Second Advent (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), by the Rev. T. Francis Glasson, B.D., M.A., D.D., is a London University D.D. dissertation of prime interest to all Gospel scholars, and not them only. Most of us, if we are honest, admit to difficulties about the doctrine of the Parousia, or Second Advent, of Jesus, especially if it is painted in 'crash-bang' colours. Yet the doctrine occurs in every New Testament book; and many feel that if Jesus Himself taught the doctrine, we must hold on to it. Yes, but did Jesus Himself prophesy His Second Advent?

Some of us, as the result of our studies, have been slowly moving to the opinion that it is very doubtful if Jesus ever taught that He was coming back 'on the clouds,' and that if the doctrine is found in the Gospels, it must be credited to the Early Church which undoubtedly held it. Now Dr. Glasson's work, which gathers up recent work on the eschatology of the Gospels (particularly Professor Dodd's), has greatly strengthened this conviction. In effect he says that the Parousia

was not a part of Jesus' message, and he goes on to explain how the Early Church's belief in it arose. For myself, I am almost convinced; for a study of Mark and Q on these lines had led me to the same conclusion.

But let me summarize the first three parts of this important book. (Part 4 we may omit here.) In Part 1 (The Parousia in Jewish Literature extant in Christ's Time) Dr. Glasson reaches these conclusions: The Old Testament contains no doctrine of the Parousia of the Messiah. Neither do the Apocrypha. The one possibly relevant document is 'The Similitudes of Enoch'—if their date is pre-Christian, a big 'if.' But the influence of 'The Similitudes' on the New Testament is very slight and very late; there is no cogent evidence that Jesus knew Enoch; and the notion of Otto that the literature of Enoch is the key to the life of Jesus is a will o' the wisp.

Part 2 (The Parousia in the Teaching of Jesus). Jesus' reply to Caiaphas (Mk 14^{62}), said by some to be Jesus' clearest prediction of His Parousia, is nothing of the kind: it predicts an ascent, not a descent. We must always lay account, says Dr. Glasson, with the evangelists' tendency to 'parousia-ize' sayings of Jesus. (*N.B.* Matthew who alone uses the word, is a notorious offender here.) Nor can we use 'the apocalyptic fly-leaf' in Mk 13 as a source for the teaching of Jesus on this subject. Jesus did predict Jerusalem's Fall, but we must carefully distinguish such prophecies from alleged prophecies of His Parousia (see *e.g.*, Lk 17^{22-37}; Q.). Even the so-called 'Advent Parables' relate to a crisis precipitated by Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom, and not to some future world-cataclysm. And, in fine, a critical examination reveals no clear evidence in the teaching of Jesus for the Parousia hope. After two excellent chapters on the Kingdom and the Messiah Dr. Glasson considers Jesus' allusions to Doomsday and concludes: 'The view that Jesus expected a speedy arrival of a great Judgment . . . does not survive close study of our original documents.' His final contention is that Jesus' ethic, His teaching about the *ecclesia*, and His words about the Gentiles, all tell against the view that He expected a speedy end of the world.

Part 3 (The Parousia in the Early Church). Whence then did the Early Church derive its strong belief in the Second Advent of Jesus? From the Old Testament, which was their Bible. The Old Testament contains many prophecies of 'The Advent of the Lord.' Once the Christians had begun to call Christ Lord, they applied Old Testament 'Lord' texts to Him, and among them those which said that the Lord would come in glory. Dr. Glasson conclusively shows that all the Parousia doctrine in 1 and 2 Thessalonians comes from the Old Testament. But if this point be granted, why the belief in the Early Church that this Second Advent was imminent? In attempting an answer we must remember that the Early Church took over also the Jewish legend of Antichrist. Antichrist was to come just before the End, and Christians believed that he had come in Caligula. There were other reasons: Jesus' own prophecy of some outstanding crisis within a generation (cf. Mk 9^{1}), the signs of the times, the Messianic excitement current about that time in Jewry, etc. All these factors convinced the early Christians not only that Christ was coming back but that it must be very soon. It was left to St. Paul (in his later Epistles) and St. John to penetrate to a truer view of the mind of Jesus by their doctrines of a *spiritual* Second Advent and of the purpose of God to sum up all things in Christ. 'The perfection of an evolving world can only come with the perfection of man,' quotes Dr. Glasson in his epilogue, 'and it is in Christ that true cosmic reconciliation will be achieved.'

This is a notable contribution to New Testament eschatology. It is essentially a book for scholars, and with its conclusions they will have to reckon. If it be replied that Dr. Glasson's view of the Second Advent is not 'orthodox,' is he not entitled to ask, Which one is? and to affirm that his is substantially the view of the Fourth Evangelist and that what was good enough for 'John' is good enough for us.

A. M. HUNTER.

THE PSALTER.

It is in Old Testament studies that all branches of the Church are most in accord with one another, and all lovers of the Bible, Protestant and Catholic, will give a warm welcome to Father Lattey's edition of the Psalms—*The Psalter in the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (Sands; 10s. 6d. net). It is only a slender piece of work, though it has a wide range of scholarship behind it; Father Lattey is engaged on a much larger and fuller treatment of the Psalter, which will, when complete, be a very valuable contribution to the study of a most difficult book. In the present volume he has given a brief introduction, touching on the more important external features of the Psalms, a complete translation, and short notes on the text. He has made use of the best modern scholarship (Gunkel's work alone receives little attention), and is ready to accept its position with absolute freedom, except in matters of authorship, where he conforms to the findings of the Biblical Commission. But there is no book in the Bible where authorship is of less importance than in this; the Psalms are valid for all time and for all conditions of men. Modern commentaries and translations are freely quoted, with a natural (and largely justifiable) preference for Herkenne and Calès, though Oesterley is frequently cited, and full use—perhaps rather too full use—is made of Driver's textual suggestions. There are, naturally, points on which readers will hold a different opinion from Father Lattey's; sometimes, for example, he makes emendations in the interests of metre which are not really necessary, even from the *Metriker's* point of view. An illustration may be found in Ps 23, where, as a matter of fact, no change whatever is required on purely metrical grounds. But Father Lattey does not stand alone here. The translation is a happy combination of

faithful rendering, both of the actual words and of the general rhythm, with dignified and musical English, though in this respect it is parallel to rather than a substitute for McFadyen. The notes are short, a number dealing with textual problems, and others giving illuminating comment on the text. The brief account of each Psalm which stands at the head of the notes is in itself a helpful commentary. In short, we have here a book which, in spite of its small size and restricted range, can safely be neglected by no one who takes the Psalter seriously.

T. H. ROBINSON.

GREAT CHRISTIAN BOOKS

Books about books fall into two classes. There is one class in which the object of the writer is to save the reader the trouble of reading the originals for himself and to give him, in summary form, a working, if a superficial knowledge, of them. There is another class in which it is the supreme aim of the writer to send the reader to the original works themselves, to give him glimpses of territories in literature hitherto unexplored, or to remind him of treasures which are in danger of being neglected or forgotten. The Rev. Hugh Martin's book, *Great Christian Books* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), very definitely falls into the second class. 'I hope,' he writes, 'to induce others to read—or re-read—the books for themselves.'

He deals with six books—'The Confessions of St. Augustine,' 'The Letters of Samuel Rutherford,' 'The Practice of the Presence of God,' by Brother Lawrence, 'The Pilgrim's Progress' by John Bunyan, 'A Serious Call' by William Law, 'An Enquiry' by William Carey, and 'The Ring and the Book' by Robert Browning. Any criticism of the choice of books is forestalled by the author himself who frankly admits that the choice is a purely personal one. Yet somehow 'The Ring and the Book' does seem strangely out of place in such a company, probably because it is in the nature of a work of fiction or at least of imagination, while the others are the authentic products of the hearts of great Christian men. Pascal, Amiel, Thomas à Kempis, Jeremy Taylor, Newman come crowding to the mind. But a personal choice has personal reasons and Mr. Martin has made his own selection.

In the opening chapter on 'The Power of the Book,' Mr. Martin quotes from the French writer, Duhamel: 'I believe that if humanity were to lose its libraries, not only would it be deprived of certain treasures of art, certain spiritual riches, but more important still it would lose its recipes for living.' A recipe for living is precisely what a great book is and therein lies the value of Mr. Martin's volume about such books.

Mr. Martin in a fine phrase speaks of 'the rhythm of adoration and work' which characterized the life of the great mystics. They lived extraordinarily near to God and yet they lived with extraordinary intensity among men. 'The Confessions' is an autobiography written in the presence of God. As Augustine himself said, 'I am speaking with myself and to myself in God's presence.' 'It is no easy thing to be a Christian,' Samuel Rutherford said, 'but for me I have gotten the victory, and Christ is holding out His arms to embrace me.' Finest of all is Brother Lawrence's great passage where he tells us how he was presented with a bewildering number of ways of devotion and how what he wanted was to be wholly God's. 'This made me resolve to give the all for the all; so after having given myself wholly to God, to make all the satisfaction I could for my sins, I renounced for the love of Him everything that was not Him; and I began to live as if there were none but He and I in the world.' To John Bunyan the road to heaven became inextricably entangled with the roads and the scenery of Bedfordshire. To William Law there was a terrific urgency in the duty of being a Christian. He looks on surface Christianity with a kind of contemptuous anger. There are those whose Christianity simply means 'adding Christian devotion to a heathen life.' The world 'by its favours has destroyed more Christians than ever it did by the most violent persecution.' True Christianity is 'an universal holiness in every part of life.' He felt keenly the handicap under which the Church suffered because of—in H. R. L. Sheppard's phrase—'the unsatisfactory lives of professing Christians.'

William Carey's 'Enquiry' will still supply material for the advocate of Foreign Missions. He, too, had to meet the objection that the state of our own country made it seem foolish to set about evangelizing the heathen; but he puts his finger on the spot. 'Our countrymen have the means of grace and may attend on the word if they choose it. They have the means of knowing the truth.' For them there is a door even if they will not use it. For the heathen there is not even a door.

The interest of the book is greatly enhanced by facsimile illustrations of the title pages of first editions of certain of the books discussed. In addition to discussing the books themselves, Mr. Martin gives very useful summaries of the lives of their writers. One criticism might be offered. Mr. Martin carefully supplies the references of the quotations which he uses except in the case of Samuel Rutherford's Letters where no references are given. It would have been an advantage to give the number of the letter quoted. The book's usefulness is increased by an excellent index.

Mr. Martin has done us a great service in sending us back to these books whose permanent value lies in the fact that they deal with the unchanging things of the human spirit.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

One of the brightest features of Europe during the German occupation was the resistance of Holland to the Nazi domination, and especially of the Dutch Church. Many of its ministers paid for this with their lives, many more with their liberty

and health. The bold deliverances of the Dutch Synod, so firm and dignified and uncompromising, represented the spirit of the people, and thanks to this the German authority never made any real headway in Holland. The story of all this has been told recently in several publications, and has been re-told in *Religious Resistance in Holland*, by Mr. H. J. Boas (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). This is a vivid account in pamphlet form of the main events, and ought to be widely read.

The 'Oxford Group' is fortunate in the literature it inspires. We have all been reading Peter Howard's 'Ideas Have Legs,' and that is very good. But the Bishop of Rangoon's *The World that Works* (Blandford Press; 5s. net) runs it close. It is all about Burma, the country and the people and his own work there. George West was a bombardier in the last war and won the Military Medal. In this war he has become a Bishop and wins the gratitude of all who read him for his account of two worlds, the world that does not work and the world that does. He has been twenty years in Burma, living for a time in a house on stilts in the Karen jungle. His 'society' consisted of head-hunters and pigmies, and naked men in silk hats who called themselves 'King of England' and 'Jock Macgregor.' It is also delightfully picturesque travel talk.

An interesting account of the history of the London Missionary Society is given in a booklet, *The Triple Jubilee of the London Missionary Society, 1795–1945*, by Mr. John George Patton (Brown & Sons; 3s. 6d. net). The 'L.M.S.' has had a glorious record of which we get glimpses here, though the speciality of this little book is the attention it pays to the part played in the foundation and work of the Society by Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire. Those who are interested in this account should go on to read 'They Found the Church There,' in which the splendid record of the 'L.M.S.' in the Christianizing of the Pacific Islands is told at length.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. are publishing a series of small books under the general title of 'Modern Christian Revolutionaries,' each at 4s. 6d. net. The Editor is Mr. Donald Attwater. The second number of the series is *Reinhold Niebuhr: Prophet from America*, by Mr. D. R. Davies. The author is an admiring student of Dr. Niebuhr's writings, and his theological and political pilgrimage has been on similar lines to Dr. Niebuhr's—to the right in theology, and to the left in politics. He tells us that readers who can only think in terms of 'either — or' fail to understand this American prophet, in whose mental process 'either — or' is balanced by 'both — and.' He also tells us that readers who do not sufficiently appreciate the tragic element in moral experience and the abysmal element in religion, also fail to understand him. The study before us is, however, in no sense an attempt to appraise Dr. Niebuhr as a theologian (though the admiring author finds him defective on the doctrine of the Church), but purely an attempt to appraise him as a Christian revolutionary, 'as one seeking to bring about fundamental social change as much as possible in accordance with Christianity.'

Able leader of Christian thought as Dr. Niebuhr is, we find a touch of exaggeration and even of malappraisement in these pages. In particular, it appears to us that the traditional theology on whose 'impregnable foundation' Dr. Niebuhr has reared a 'revolutionary social theory,' is not so traditional, so orthodox, as Mr. Davies might lead us to think.

Nicolas Berdyaev and the New Middle Ages (James Clarke; 4s. 6d. net) is the fifth number in the publishers' new series, 'Modern Christian Revolutionaries.' The author, Dr. Evgueny Lampert, appears to have a certain affinity with Berdyaev's thought, and more especially with his problems, and stresses the importance of this for his task—no easy one. He prefaces his work with a useful list of Berdyaev's works, mentioning translations in English, or failing this in French or German. After a brief sketch of Berdyaev's career he discusses him as a thinker, warning us that Berdyaev can hardly be described as a 'Russian Orthodox Theologian.' In his teaching concerning God-manhood he finds the quintessence of Berdyaev's thought. 'Both philosophy and theology,' says Berdyaev, 'should start neither with God nor with man, but rather with the God-man. The basic and original phenomenon of life is the meeting and interaction of God and man, the movement of God towards man and of man towards God.'

The idea of God-manhood leads us to those elements in Berdyaev's thought which he himself describes as 'existential.' Unlike one type of existentialist, he does not deny God; unlike another type, he does not deny man. He is pre-eminently a Christian. Around Christ the God-man his thought centres. If, on the one hand, he repudiates the humanism which does not give man his full dignity, which reaches to the heavens; on the other hand, he repudiates the anti-humanism which almost demonically revolts against any link and vital relation between the creature and his Creator. It is a revolt against the eternal mystery of God-manhood.

The vital importance of the religious element in education is the main theme in *Church, College, and Nation*, by Mr. G. R. Elliott, Ph.D., Litt.D., Folger Professor of English in Amherst College (The Cloister Press, Louisville; $2.00). All great cultures are due to religion, says Dr. Elliott, and the great disaster of our time has been that religion has ceased to be the dominant inspiration of culture. One reason of this Dr. Elliott traces to the 'Great Schism.' This was at the Reformation. If only the Church had remained one, with its defects remedied but its unity unimpaired, we should not have had the religious decline that has been progressively visible since. The reasons for this view cannot be stated in a few sentences, but

the importance of it for Dr. Elliott's interpretation of religious history is very great. He thinks one of the major desiderata is the reunion of Christendom. On that will follow a new birth of religious life which will then dominate college, church and nation. In the course of his advocacy of this thesis Dr. Elliott has much that is interesting to say of culture and religion, of 'college deism' and secular influence, and of relevant topics. This is an interesting and enlightening book on a vital subject.

The Crises of the Christ (Pickering & Inglis; 12s. 6d. net), by the late Dr. Campbell Morgan, is a reprint of a book he published more than forty years ago. In his preface he says that, although all these years have intervened, there is nothing in the book he would wish to change. The book itself is a devotional life of Christ in terms of the great crises in His life—The Birth, Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension. At the beginning he quotes Ruskin: 'You have had various critical lives of Christ, German and other, lately provided among your severely critical historical studies. But there is only one light by which you can read the life of Christ—the light of the life you now lead in the flesh, and that not the natural but the won life.' The whole book is commentary on that pregnant saying. Here, as ever, we find Dr. Morgan the indefatigable searcher of the Scriptures, and the Christ-inspired evangelist. If he is too conservative for 'the severely historical' critics, no one can read his pages without admiring his spiritual insight, his gift of exposition, and his flaming loyalty to his Lord.

Books of prayers still stream from the press in rich profusion. *Private and Public Prayers*, by the Rev. Wilton Rix (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), has merits of its own. It is not liturgical in form, but it is comprehensive, unconventional, and catholic, and includes devotions from Evelyn Underhill, from the Eastern and Western Liturgies, from Tagore, from Canon Dearmer and George Dawson, and (largely) from Mr. Dix himself. The editor sensibly believes that non-liturgical churches should avail themselves of the best from all sources. This is part of their 'freedom.' And his book will enrich the public devotions of any one who uses it.

The Instability of Theism.

II.

By Emeritus Principal David S. Cairns, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Problem of Reconciliation. Here I would start with two fundamental conditions which we, who in substance hold by the ancient faith, share with those who hold by the strictly unitary conception of God. We all alike believe that the only God worth believing in is the God of absolute moral perfection, and we all believe that man is made for full communion with God. Our moral nature demands the first and our religious nature requires the second. But how is that communion to be attained, kept, and developed? How is the unholy to commune with the holy, the sinner with his Judge? If I am not wholly at ease with my own conscience (and what morally sane man is?), how can I possibly be at ease with the omniscient conscience, who is also the Sovereign Reality and Power? And if I cannot be at ease in His Presence, how is it possible for me to live in happy filial communion with Him? Here I cannot but feel there is a deep defect in simple Theism. Its gravity is realized when we see that it arises from a conflict between the moral and the religious nature of man. It may be said that this is an exaggerated view. Were not the Hebrews ethical monotheists and is not the Psalter a proof which all must acknowledge that such communion is possible? 'O God, thou art my God; earnestly will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee, in a dry and weary land, where no water is. So have I looked upon thee in the sanctuary, to see thy power and thy glory. Because thy lovingkindness is better than life, my lips shall praise thee—my mouth shall praise thee with joyful lips; when I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches. For thou hast been my help, and in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice' (Ps 63^{1-7}). What can beat that as an example of the communion with God which one may have under simple ethical monotheism? And, as we know, that Psalm is only one of many.

But that is to miss the point entirely. What is forgotten is that there was a great deal more than ethical monotheism in the faith of all the Psalmists. There was the profound conviction that God was already in Covenant relation with Israel. Each Psalmist by birth, and the initiatory rite, was within that Covenant. That meant that God had

already taken the initiative of grace with him and was keeping and would keep that initiative with him all the way through. The mention of the 'sanctuary' should remind us of that. The sanctuary, to every true Israelite, was the place in which in a peculiar way God dwelt, the God of all grace. No one can really understand the Old Testament who does not realize how absolutely fundamental is this conception of the Covenant of Grace to all that is noblest in the Prophets and in the Psalter. It is not too much to say that it is as basal in their conception of God as is His righteousness, or moral perfection as we should call it.

It is like a geological stratum that underlies all the soil, and plant and animal and human life in any region. It is the presupposition of all the warnings of the Prophets and all the confidence of the Psalmists. It implies that very precious thing, the Divine initiative or, as the older Christian theologians called it, the prevenient grace of God. Now it is precisely here that, it seems to me, simple modern Theism is relatively weak. It has in it nothing really corresponding to that great act of Divine Grace which every true Israelite believed he had behind him in his history which set him in grace relations with the holy God. Instead of that he has the vast ambiguous world of Nature and history, the macrocosm. That is the tremendous background of his faith which like all of us he is seeking to explain. But he has, also, his own inner life, the microcosm within the macrocosm, his reason and conscience, and his dim but persistent sense of One who is over all and who is friendly or may be made friendly to men. Out of the inner life of the soul with its sense of duty and its ideals of the true, the beautiful and the good, he seeks to explain the universe, and reasons his way through to Theism. I believe that he is right in so doing. But has he really solved that problem of which I have spoken, the problem of Reconciliation and Communion, without compromising either the Divine perfection, or the profound need of the human spirit for communion with its Father? I do not think that he has. He has simply thought and felt his way to the point where the problem appears in all its formidable character. His faith has in it nothing corresponding to that great mystery of Divine grace which every true Israelite believed that he had behind him in his history, which set him in grace relations with his God. I do not think that this difficulty is really met for any thoroughgoing inquirer by pointing to individual men and women who seem to have been able to live filial lives on what seems to many of us to be a bare enough creed. There are some men and women in our confused age who have lived noble and disinterested lives in what would seem, both to simple Theists and those who hold the full Christian view of God, to be no creed at all. In our day we have to remember that however imperfect our civilization may be there has not been a Christendom for nearly twenty centuries for nothing, and we must be prepared to see the influence of Jesus of Nazareth to-day in the lives and ideals of many who would even repudiate the name of Christian. And in like manner we may recognize in some men a very real sense of God's grace, to whom the Cross is only the death of a human martyr instead of the supreme manifestation of the grace of God. To me, I confess, that on that reduction of the gospel, while the Cross would reveal the greatness of the man who hung upon it, it must also reveal the brutality of mankind and, what is more serious still, would strengthen the case for the moral indifference of the Universe. And I cannot help the conviction that in the long run that would be the verdict of the majority. But the main point is as to whether simple Theism really faces and solves the real problem of which I have spoken. That even the Prophets did not solve it for their people the history of Judaism shows only too plainly. Even the consciousness which they and the Psalmists had of the grace of God faded under the pressure of adverse fortune, and, as an inevitable consequence, the new sense of the moral perfection of God which the Prophets had brought in led on to the legalism of Judaism, and the sway of Scribe and Pharisee on the one hand, and the wild visions of the Jewish apocalypses on the other. Obsessed by the last, Judaism became obsessed by the Judgment to come. We get some measure of this lapse by noting that while the 119th Psalm is full of 'an overflowing and glorious passion for the Law of God,' to St. Paul 'the great pathologist of Judaism,' as Wellhausen called him, the Law had become an intolerable burden, and that whereas in the Psalms the Judgment was something so supremely good that the singers sometimes call on all Nature and all men to exult with them in expectation of its speedy coming, in 4 Esdras, a Jewish apocalypse dating from the second half of the first Christian century, it is a day of gloom and terror in which a mere remnant of humanity, Jew or Gentile, will be acquitted by the Judge of all. And where the simple Theism of the Hebrew prophets, with the covenant grace to support it, failed to maintain itself and lapsed into Judaism it does not seem to me that simple Theism alone can permanently hold its own, save as a kind of concomitant of the fuller Christian faith, critical of it and yet largely though indirectly dependent upon it. On that fuller faith we have the gulf between the Holy and Perfect God and sinful

man bridged by a new and direct initiative of grace, of 'God manifest in the flesh.' The Incarnation discloses an altogether new depth and range in the love of God. It is a cosmic act. It is meant to do for the whole human race what the Old Covenant did for Israel. That is why the Christian Church took over the Old Testament as one of its two Testaments and made a 'Bible' of them. It is very unfortunate that the word Testament should have been used to translate the original Hebrew word for Covenant. The Incarnation is the supreme manifestation of that most precious thing, the prevenient Grace of God, the Divine Initiative of Love of which the earlier covenant was an anticipation and also an actual part, as the spring flowers are at once a prophecy and yet also the vanguard of the armies that are yet to come. Our Lord Himself linked up the Old Covenant with the New by words which we hear repeated at every observance of the Sacrament of the Last Supper. 'This cup is the New Covenant in my blood.' The reference here is obviously to the sacrifice which according to Hebrew usage ratified the Covenant at Sinai. As I have said, the New Covenant unlike the Old is meant to be with the whole human race. In scope and Divine intention it is universal. And the whole manifestation of Jesus Christ and His Life, Death, and Resurrection and the Coming of the Spirit are to the full Christian faith a guarantee that God Himself has entered human life to solve that human problem and resolve the conflict between the moral and religious nature of man, and, through that solution, seeks communion with every human being, the worst as well as the best. The classical expression of that truth is the saying in the Fourth Gospel, 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Herrman has put the heart of the matter in our modern time in two memorable sayings: 'All our communion with God depends on God's communion with us.' 'He that has not seen the Grace of God as a great wonder has never seen it at all.' Viewed from the human side the immediate problem is solved by the simple fact that God in Christ comes to him. Christ is not simply a man telling us about the love of God, He is God coming to us, making all the advances and keeping the initiative all the time and all the way. How He can do this and remain Holy Love, is the concern of Christian Theology and can only be fully considered in the wider context of Christian doctrine. Personally, I believe that the Cross and Resurrection are the focal point of Revelation in which the Grace of God and the sin of man and the great vicarious law of recompense which sustains the moral order of the Universe, are all once for all made plain by God Himself, and that that is the heart of any true Doctrine of the Atonement.

But the faith which accepts God's Grace and by so doing confesses its own sin is a simpler matter. It may, for the time, be content to say of that deep problem of how the Holy Love can forgive sin and commune with the sinner, 'That is God's secret. Meantime He assures me that He has solved the problem, and that if I simply live within His grace He will solve all my other problems as well.'

(*To be concluded.*)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Happiness and Joy.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Killermont.

'Thou hast put gladness in my heart.'—Ps 4[7].

What makes people glad? How is it that they go about so often with a cheerful feeling in their hearts? This Psalm says that gladness is a gift from God. 'Thou hast put gladness in my heart.' While we give thanks for this gift it is well to think a little about it. There are many kinds of gladness. One poet, the Belgian writer called Maeterlinck, in a play called *The Blue Bird*, made this list of them. It is in two divisions, one called 'The Little Happinesses,' the other, 'The Great Joys.'

A most important one in the first division is the happiness of being well and strong, a common children's happiness. You don't perhaps think often about it, yet it is there, making you run about and laugh and talk, the happiness of good health. Then there is the happiness of fresh air. When one leaves what Browning calls

'the crowded city's horrible street'

and gets away to the seaside or the open country fields, one's spirits go bounding up and one feels twice as happy. And there is the happiness of seeing pretty and lovely things, toys in the shop-windows and flowers in the park, and the sun rising in the East in the morning and the stars

shining in the sky at night. The very look of beautiful things gives a glad feeling in the heart.

These are the kinds of gladness that this poet calls Happiness. In the other division are glad feelings that have in them something solemn and majestic, so that he calls them 'The Great Joys.'

There is the joy of being just. A judge sits in his court where people come to him with a quarrel or disagreement. Lawyers argue the case on both sides and it is difficult to say what is exactly fair. The wise judge listens and thinks it over, examining the question carefully, and then he pronounces his decision. He gets a joy in his heart from ending the dispute and settling what is right and doing justice. Even a boy may have this kind of joy or satisfaction. Suppose he is asked to make a fair division of some present among his brothers and sisters, or suppose a big boy is asked to referee a match for some little ones, and he is quite strict and fair, he finds a kind of serious pleasure in being just.

Then there is the joy of understanding. Sometimes a sum or mathematical exercise seems very difficult, and you are quite puzzled. Then as you keep looking at it, or perhaps as someone gives a word of explanation, suddenly you see how it is done, and feel quite pleased with yourself. Or, it may be, you wish to get the meaning of a poem, and at first sight it does not seem to make clear sense. The words are unusual and it sounds as if it were about nothing very important. Then suddenly you see the idea in it. The disciples at first did not understand Jesus when He spoke the parable about the sower sowing the seed. Only when He explained that the good seed was His teaching did they understand. It is a great joy to understand what is true.

And there is the great joy of loving. This is a deeper thing than happiness. In fact it does not always make people happy. If you love someone who is ill or in pain, it may make you sorry. If you love someone who is weak or helpless, you may have to take a lot of trouble for them and work for them. Even children may sometimes work quite hard to help their mothers whom they love. But even though it is not such a light-hearted gladness as pure happiness, still it is the deepest, greatest joy in life to be able to love and to have people to love.

You see what a number of happinesses and joys there are in life. For them all God is to be praised who planned our human life in this way. 'Thou,' says the Psalmist, 'hast put gladness in my heart.'

An Epiphany Gift.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.A., B.D., Birregurra, Victoria, Australia.

'They presented unto him gifts.'—Mt 2^{11}.

What a great time Christmas is! For weeks and weeks we look forward to it, counting the sleeps; and before we know where we are it is gone. And there's a whole year to wait for another Christmas.

But although the day soon goes, the Christmas feeling stays a while, doesn't it? I suppose you young folks really don't lose it till you go back to school. Then presents have to make way for lessons. Another year's work comes crowding in to fill your mind and time.

In the Church, however, Christmas celebrations last for twelve days. They begin with Christmas and finish with Epiphany. And what's Epiphany? How many of you know?

Well, Christmas is the 25th of December and Epiphany is the 6th of January. On Christmas Day we read and sing about the shepherds in the fields—how they heard the angels sing and hurried off to see 'the little Lord Jesus asleep on the hay.' On Epiphany we read and sing about the Wise Men from the East—how they came riding on camels and guided by a star, looking for the Babe that was 'born to be King' of the Jews. The shepherds were Jews; the Wise Men were not. So Epiphany celebrates the showing of the Son of God to the Gentiles or foreigners, as we should say to-day.

Now, we get that word Epiphany from a Greek verb, *phaino*, which means 'to show.' You know what cellophane is—that nice smooth, clean wrapping round Christmas presents which shows you what you are buying while protecting it from the air and dust. Well, cellophane and Epiphany are words that are related: they both have this Greek verb *phaino*. You see that, don't you? And they both suggest the idea of 'showing' something or someone, and showing clearly. Epiphany, then, is 'the showing'—or manifestation, to use the big word—of the Son of God to the Gentiles.

Now, when people go to see a new baby, they take a present. It's not easy nowadays to get presents for babies or for anyone else. We found that out when we went looking for something for Christmas, didn't we? Of course, we could get perfume, for that is what frankincense was. And how little girls love a bottle of scent! And we could get ointment, for that is what myrrh was. But who wants a box of ointment for Christmas? Rather like getting a bottle of medicine, isn't it? And as for gold: well, who has any gold to-day? I wonder how many of you have ever seen a gold coin. Sovereigns are a rare sight nowadays.

Here, then, is what the Wise Men of long ago brought to the Infant Jesus—gold and frankincense and myrrh. And still to-day, as the hymn says:

> 'The wise may bring their learning,
> The rich may bring their wealth.'
> But 'We have no wealth or learning;
> What shall we children bring?'

Well, now, what did the shepherds in the fields bring? We don't know. We're not told. The Bible doesn't say that they brought anything. But I would not be surprised to learn some day that later on they sent a lamb—a lovely little lamb—to be a playmate, whose wool would make a warm cuddly jacket or blanket. Yes, but what can you and I give the Lord Jesus this Epiphany?

There is a beautiful carol in our book which suggests something. Listen—

What can I give Him,
Poor as I am?
If I were a shepherd,
I would bring a lamb;
If I were a wise man,
I would do my part;
Yet what I can I give Him—
Give my heart.

You know what that means.

The Christian Year.

God is Light.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., LARGS.

'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.'—1 Jn 1^5.

There is a French saying which runs, 'When a man is right, he is more right than he thinks.' There can be little dispute about the veracity of that. It was not so many years back when the bulk of men declared emphatically that no body heavier than air could possibly fly. There was a small group, however, who dared to believe to the contrary, and their faith was justified with the invention of the aeroplane. But those visionaries never dreamt of mammoth air liners cleaving the air at breakneck speed, or flying bombs, or pilotless planes. Those who, before the invention of the aeroplane, credited that a body heavier than air could fly were right, but they were more right than they thought.

It is likewise with John. When he declared that God was light he was right, but he was more right than he thought. By describing God as light, John meant that the only two properties of light known to him in his unscientific age were the properties of God. His meaning was that as light made things visible, so God is One who makes Himself visible to men, and that as light purifies, so God is the great Purifier. But modern science has discovered many more properties of light of which John was ignorant. Allow a shaft of light to fall on a glass prism and the spectrum, a band of light of many pretty hues, is seen. This reveals that light is composed of different rays. Not only are there red, yellow, green, and violet rays of light, but other colourless rays also. Now the extraordinary thing is that when the properties of these various rays of which light is composed are examined, it is found they are also properties of God.

Consider, then, this declaration of John's that God is light in relation to the findings of modern science.

I. Science has discovered that there are rays of light known as X-rays which have the property of revealing the inner constitution of the human body. By means of a clever invention the rays of light known as X-rays are selected and focused on the body, for they have the property of penetrating the human frame and revealing its inner nature.

Now God is light; and like the X-rays He is able to penetrate the beings of all men and discern everything that lies within them. This is what Scripture means when it speaks of God looking not upon the outward appearance but upon the heart.

It is this unique property which gives God the title to be the judge of men.

That lover of the poets, Macneile Dixon, points out that Dante in his *Inferno* assigns this one to the shuddering torments of hell and that one to the bliss of heaven with confidence. But perhaps the poet would have altered his opinions had he known that a disease of the pituitary gland can make a criminal out of a man and that a child can become a wastrel through a hereditary twist. Had such knowledge belonged to Dante surely such a genius could not have failed to see that he did not know what lay within his fellows and made them what they were; that neither he, nor any other, was qualified to stand in judgment of his fellow-men.

Leopardi sings about death and the desirability of courting it. Had that disconcerting sceptic, Henley, been asked for his opinion he would probably have replied that for any poet to write of death is a waste of time, for there is nothing which a healthy man thinks of less. So full of life and the world with its wonders are men in full prime that scarcely ever do they cast a thought to death; and they give less consideration to judgment. But the New Testament makes it clear that as sure as death will overtake every one, so all men will one day appear before God to be judged. But, what right has He to judge us? What guarantee is there that He will not seriously misjudge us as we constantly do our fellow-men? Here is His title to judge us and our surety that His judgment will be fair and right. Like the X-rays of light He can penetrate the human frame and uncannily discern all that lies within, for 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.'

II. Again, modern science has discovered that there are rays of light known as infra-red rays which possess the property of making clear objects obscured by haze. Some years ago, a series of beautiful photographs appeared in the London *Times*. Several of these were of distant landscapes, such as the French coast taken from across the Channel. On the days on which these photographs were taken the objects were enshrouded in haze and almost invisible to the naked eye. Yet, in the prints, the landscapes appeared in such clarity as if they had been taken on the brightest of days. How was the miracle wrought? Plates were made sensitive to infra-red rays and a filter fitted over the lens to allow mostly infra-red rays of light from the landscapes to penetrate to the plates.

Now God is light, and like the infra-red rays He makes clear many a thing in this world which

is obscured by haze. To recount all of these is impossible. Mention may be made of perhaps the most important in the catalogue only, by way of demonstration, namely, goodness. If a man has no belief in God he is thrown into complete confusion about goodness. Why should men be kind, courageous, sympathetic, unselfish, and lay down their lives for others? It is Jesus who gives the clue when He says, 'Why callest thou me good? There is but one good and that is God.' The source of all His goodness and of every man's He maintains is God. When a man turns from unbelief to God then goodness, which has been a mystery to him, becomes understandable. God lifts the haze from it.

Admitted, to believe in God makes evil a problem, but to have faith in a good Creator of this universe solves more mysteries by far than it creates. Like infra-red rays making clear so many things enshrouded in haze, so God makes clear so much which to faithless men are baffling insolubles. For 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.'

III. Lastly, modern science has discovered that there are rays of light known as ultra-violet rays, which have the property of discharging negative electricity from alkali metals. By means of an electrical machine it is possible to load a piece of zinc with negative electricity until the tension is so great that the metal begins to spark. If some ultra-violet rays of light are allowed to fall on the zinc, however, sparking immediately ceases, for these rays have the power of being able to discharge or absorb into themselves all the electrical energy contained in the metal.

Now God is light, and like the ultra-violet rays He absorbs all the energies of men to accomplish His work in this world. When Jesus sat by the Temple treasury and witnessed wealthy Pharisees cast in substantial contributions, He was not impressed. They had not to go dinnerless to give handsomely. But when a ridiculously extravagant widow woman put in all her worldly wealth of two mites, the Master's heart leapt with joy. What, pray, was there to rejoice about in such recklessness? It was not only because it tokened a generous spirit, or because it was away from calculated goodness which never impressed Him much, but because He realized it was only through people of that type willing to give their all, as He Himself would have to do, that God's work can be accomplished in the world.

The strange thing is that the opposite idea holds in the Church. 'God is not a pauper,' thundered Alistair Maclean of Daviot when speaking on niggardly giving, 'God is not a pauper, but don't you think we do our best to make Him feel like one?' Into their business, their sports and their pleasures men will pour their brains, their energy, and their money, but into the work of God they cast what is spare and costs nothing.

Chesterton pictures the Church rushing through the ages like a winged thunderbolt of enthusiasm. This was a true description of the Church in Paul's and Wesley's and Chalmers' time, but is it of ours? What a dismal record greets the eye! In the foreign field disgraceful retreat threatened; at home seventy-five per cent. of Scotsmen outwith the Church, and little effort being made to win them; throughout the land churches struggling to make ends meet and to keep their doors open when there should be affluence. Why this sorry state of affairs? Stage all the reasons we care, but is not the blunt truth, in the main, that in the Church of our time we are trying to do the work of God on the cheap; and God Himself is even working against us to bring us to the knowledge that like the infra-red rays absorbing all the electrical energy of zinc, so He demands everything in Christian folk to accomplish His gigantic work of saving this crazy world. For 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.'

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Faith of a Realist.

BY THE VERY REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, B.D., M.A., THE COLLEGE, MILLPORT.

'Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.'—Jn 20^{28}.

St. Thomas's Day falls so near to Christmas that in looking forward to the great festival of the Incarnation we are apt to forget St. Thomas. Doubting Thomas we call him, and we think of him as the hesitant, half-hearted disciple, but what do we know about him besides this one incident when he doubted his fellow-disciples' report of our Lord's Resurrection?

The first three Gospels tell us next to nothing about him. In them he is little more than a name, but in the Fourth Gospel there is some additional information about him. We read there that when the message came to our Lord that His friend Lazarus was ill, He and His disciples had gone to get some quiet on the other side of Jordan. Our Lord at once proposed to go back to Bethany in Judæa, but the disciples tried to dissuade Him. Did He not remember, they asked, what risks He would run if He did that; the Jews were ready to stone Him. But our Lord was determined to go, and St. Thomas supported Him in his decision. He was not unaware of the danger, but if his Master was ready to face it, so was he. Let us also go, that we may die with Him, he cried. That was not the action of a hesitating coward. We sometimes speak as though to give and not to count the cost were the climax of self-oblation, but what of those who cannot help counting the cost and, having counted it, are still ready to give? Is their discipleship of a lower order?

St. Thomas was like that, and this feature of his character comes out a little later in the fourteenth chapter of this same Gospel when our Lord was delivering His last discourses to His disciples on the eve of His Passion. Whither I go, ye know; and the way ye know, He said. But St. Thomas was puzzled. Lord, we know not whither thou goest: how know we the way? he asked. Would you or I have known any better what our Lord meant, and, not knowing, would we have

had the courage of St. Thomas to ask the question that he asked? Or would we have concealed our ignorance by nodding assent?

St. Thomas represents the type of those who demand tangible proofs and precise definitions. There have always been people like that and always will be. Can such critical and half-hearted people ever become real disciples? The story of St. Thomas shows what our Lord can make of them. St. Thomas was no optimist, but our Lord would not make the mistake of regarding the hesitation of His disciple as disloyalty. He would not forget how St. Thomas had taken the lead in readiness to suffer with his Master.

For him, as for the rest, the Crucifixion was the end of his hopes. Yet he remained in their company. Some have thought that his absence from the room with the closed doors where the risen Lord appeared before His astonished followers indicates that St. Thomas had separated himself from the rest, but his absence on that occasion was probably accidental. On the next Lord's Day (the Greek Church still calls the Sunday after Easter St. Thomas's Sunday) he was there with them, meeting for worship and conference.

He had not been able to bring himself to believe the report of his friends that they had indeed seen their Lord. 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe,' he says. And so, at the next meeting in the room with the closed doors, our Lord anticipated His disciple's demand, saying, 'Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.'

For St. Thomas recognition was adoration. The disciple who had been so ready to suffer with his Master was convinced by what Charles Wesley's hymn calls those dear tokens of His Passion. Did he accept his Lord's invitation and carry out in full the proof that he had demanded? An ancient collect assumes that he did. With questioning hand, it says, Thomas reached unto Thy life-giving side, O Christ. But more likely the sight of the dear tokens was enough; and with his cry of adoration St. Thomas disappears from the Bible narrative.

According to an ancient tradition, when the different parts of the world were assigned severally to the disciples for evangelization it was India that fell to St. Thomas. Again, so it is said, he hesitated, but he was persuaded by a vision of Christ who sold him as a slave to an Indian merchant. So he came to India, and in the end his ministry was crowned by martyrdom. The tradition is a little uncertain, but nevertheless there exists in India to-day a large native Church counting more than a million members that traces its origin to the mission of St. Thomas the Apostle.

The apostleship of St. Thomas is an inspiration to those who, like him, demand tangible proof and precise definition, and whose hesitation is grounded, not in cowardice, but in what they would call realism. It shows how for them too discipleship is possible. But note well how the discipleship of St. Thomas was maintained. He continued in fellowship with the others even when he could no longer share all their hopes. It was in that holy fellowship that he found the solution of his doubts. His questionings were not made into an excuse for slackness.

Here he can teach a lesson to many of us. Our so-called realism, our questionings, our doubts make us impatient of those who do not or seem not to share them, and we separate ourselves from them, neglecting public worship, and failing to take our place with the people of God, whereas it is precisely in that fellowship which we spurn that we shall find the renewal of our faith.

It was by the print of the nails, the tokens of the Passion that St. Thomas recognized his Lord. Can we not see the tokens of that same Passion in the Church which is Christ's Body? Like her Lord the Church is reviled, scoffed at, set at nought by the world. These are the things that make men speak of the failure of the Church. They are nothing of the kind: they are the surest evidence of her divine mission, the marks of Jesus.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY.

The New Road from Bethlehem.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU.

'They' (the wise men) 'departed into their own country another way.'—Mt 2^{12}.

Once more we celebrate the coming of Jesus Christ to this world with feast and song. What difference will it make on Christmas Day and thereafter to our lives? We have obeyed the summons, 'Let us now go even unto Bethlehem and see this thing which is come to pass . . .' But *what* have we seen? and how will that vision of the little King alter the direction of our spiritual lives? William Watson in a short poem which is rather sombre and sceptical implies that, so far as he could see, Christmas Day meant very little to people in general. It was a bright morning and the crowds wore their best, but he saw no touch of veneration or of awe in the general face.

> Christ's natal day? 'Twas merely one day more
> On which the mart agreed to close its door;
> A lounging-time by usage and by law
> Sanctioned; nor recked they, beyond this, one straw
> Of any meaning which for man it bore!

According to William Watson we are 'waiting till some new world-emotion rise, which shall make a clean sweep of our dying past that never dies.' There is a note of wistful agnosticism, too, in a poem of Thomas Hardy's, in which he refers to the old belief that at twelve of the clock on Christmas Eve, the oxen kneel in their pens in veneration of the Holy Child.

> So fair a fancy few would weave
> In these years! Yet, I feel,
> If someone said on Christmas Eve,
> 'Come; see the oxen kneel

'In the lonely barton by yonder coomb
Our childhood used to know,'
I should go with him in the gloom,
Hoping it might be so.

There is no glad confidence or joy in such a feeble hope as Hardy expresses; yet be it said that is just what Christmas means for very many. A fair fancy, a lovely old legend, a kindly custom—and that is all.

But in contrast to all that, the thought Matthew suggests to us is that, when once we have been in the spirit at Bethlehem and worshipped and seen the Christ, things can never be the same dull joyless routine. The wise men saw and worshipped and when they went away, they departed to their own country by another way. You may regard this sentence, if you please, as a simple statement of fact. To return by another way was undoubtedly safer. The wise men had been warned and they accepted the heavenly guidance. But we may think of it as being more than an indication of an altered itinerary, more than a topographical detail. We may think of it as a description in figurative speech of an inner spiritual pilgrimage. Let us look at it then in this deeper sense—that after we have truly seen Jesus, something takes place in the soul which alters everything, our aims and motives and ambitions, our whole viewpoint.

These wise men came to Bethlehem, but the way of return to their own country was not the same as the way to Bethlehem. Something happened between their arrival at Bethlehem and their departure from it. What was it? It was this—they had been to the manger, they had gazed upon the face of the Holy Child, they had knelt at His feet and worshipped Him. If they had taken the same homeward way, it would still have been another way in the deeper sense of the spiritual pilgrimage.

I. Here then in the first place was *a new experience*. These wise men saw something, or rather they saw Some One they had never seen before and the sight made all the difference in the world. They recognized in the little child the King of Kings and Lord of Lords. They saw the Divinity shining through the homely human scene. They knelt down and worshipped Him and offered gifts most rare. That is how people act when their eyes are opened. When their eyes were opened, they saw Him.

The difference it makes is incommensurable. After St. Paul met Jesus on the road to Damascus, things were for ever utterly new. Up to that point life had been a very grim, painful quest, but now the toilsome search was over, and he could say, 'Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' That day God who once made the light to shine out of darkness caused it to illuminate my cold darkened heart, he said, yet even that was only a beginning. The young ruler came to Jesus, full of his own blameless record. He too went back another way, but it could not have been a bright or joyful road for he had made the great refusal. Pilate's wife had only the most remote contact with Jesus, yet she too felt the marvellous power of that great personality and the road of life could never again be quite the same humdrum thing for her. And in spite of Anatole France's insinuation that long after the trial and crucifixion of Christ Pilate could not recall the name of the Galilean who had one day so altered the even tenor of his way, we believe that for him too things were different and that he went softly all his days.

For ah! the Master is so fair,
His smile so sweet to banished men,
That they who meet it unaware
Can never rest on earth again.

Really to know and believe in Christ and really to behold His face is to know that life has been made altogether new.

II. That new experience entailed *a new responsibility* and a new *service of humanity*. A new viewpoint is given and a fresh burden is imposed.

Are we not justified in trying to picture this new task that is laid upon all who have seen the King? When the wise men got back again to their own land they must have communicated something of the uplift and inspiration they had experienced. We simply can't believe that they would be satisfied merely with having offered gifts most rare at the cradle. They must have braced themselves to do something for their people.

We can say this at least with certainty—that the wise men of any age owe this at least to their fellows—that they should share with others the mighty secrets of truth and knowledge they have got and point out the avenues by which nations may be led into the way of peace. By their gifts of mind and heart, by their endowments and strength of personality they can blaze a new trail for mankind. The statesman, the scientist, the novelist, the poet and the journalist—all these have a great opportunity and responsibility in the new age. What use will they make of their gifts of intellect? How will they invest their influence?

Look at that list again and from it select only three. Think of the politician who is not out for party or partisan ends, but has only the highest interests of his country at heart. Think of the scientist who will consecrate his gifts of research to defeat disease and all death-spreading inventions and show up the diabolic spirit of race-suicide, and bring in the day of Christ. Think of the novelist who gains access to millions of homes, and shows the sacredness of human love, the nobility of Christian standards and shuns as poison all insidious flouting of morality and all bespattering with filth the sweet sanctities of life.

For them this may be a hard road, but Faraday and Clerk Maxwell, and Romanes and Kelvin did not find it impossible, neither did Tennyson or Browning, Dickens or Meredith. Neither did Gladstone or Keir Hardie, or the Earl of Shaftesbury or William Wilberforce. The Apostle Paul who was himself an intellectual did not find it an impossible road, but freely sacrificed much that he at one time counted precious that he might

find Christ and be found of Him, and be all things to all men for His sake.

The new road which leads from Bethlehem where men gazed upon the face of Jesus may not, I say, be an easy one, it may even be one of renunciation and humility. It is also the road of the loving hearts. But one thing we may say with entire confidence is this, that without that vision and without that experience all our vaunted wisdom and all our most perfect schemes will come to dust and ashes.

Yes, the star of Bethlehem, and the light on the Damascus road and the light in the soul of any one who has truly worshipped and loved the Christ are one. We all need the guidance that comes from revelation and the power that streams from consecrated personality, and the love that was kindled at the manger of the Holy Child. Will you remember this when you sing your Christmas hymns and make your communion on Christ's natal day? Will you realize that He is coming afresh to our deeply troubled world and that He is most certainly knocking at the door of your life so that He may come in and make all things new? And a changed heart always means a changed programme?

Epiphany.

By the Reverend A. D. Harcus, D.D.

'Ye have not passed this way heretofore.'—Josh 3^4.

Israel's story has made good reading in the war years. The escape from Egypt, the wanderings in the desert, how they were guided day and night, and how their wants were met, all these have been lessons for us as we escaped dangers and endured in the years of waiting. Some of the details of the story have come to life in the experiences of these days, manna from heaven, enough but not too much for each day, surely the forerunner of rationing; and the raiment that waxed not old these forty years! In the chapter we are considering all these things are past, the nation at long last has turned the corner, out of the desert, and the road is now straight for the Promised Land. It was at this point, with the river Jordan (in flood at harvest time) facing them, that the special order was given by officers who went from tent to tent through the whole host, and the order was that a space of two thousand cubits by measure was to be left between the ark of the covenant borne by the priests and the rest of the company. And the reason given was, 'for ye have not passed this way heretofore.'

The reason fits our circumstances to-day. At any time a New Year Sunday would stress the sense of the future all unknown, we are conscious of turning a corner and a new stretch of the road is before us. But this year is indeed a future all unknown. It is the first year of the peace and will see undoubtedly many of the war-time emergencies give place to more normal ways. It will be a year of homecomings on a large scale; the community, and the church will this year have to be ready to welcome a great multitude of those who have been away from home and civilian life for six years. It must inevitably be a time of reordering and refashioning: many new things and ways will have to be tried. The church is conscious already of a new missionary task; there has been a complete overturning in the Far East and this coming year will test us. Can we answer a new challenge, can we show that the gospel is more than equal to the opportunity of this new age? And behind all thinking of the future, in both nation and church, is the shadow of the new discovery, the release of atomic energy. The words addressed to the nation of Israel ring out for us to-day: 'I have set before thee life and death, the blessing and the curse: therefore choose life, that thou mayest live, thou and thy seed.' As we look out into the future aware of the new situation, of a multitude of minor factors and one or two great major facts, we may well seek guidance of the Word of God, for we have not passed this way heretofore.

And this chapter records the kind of common-sense guidance that abounds in Scripture and especially in the story of Israel's sojourn in the wilderness. The officers went through the host commanding the people that when they saw the ark of the covenant move towards Jordan they must leave a space between them and it of two thousand cubits. The reason for the order is clear. It was a new way, perhaps they knew only too well the old familiar desert tracks used by them and their fathers for forty years. Now there would be the excitement, the thrill of the road that pointed directly to the Promised Land. The whole multitude, not forgetting the children, would be astir. We need not ask the exact form of the miracle that made possible the crossing of the river but reading between the lines one is aware of risks and dangers. It must be an ordered crossing and the place of the passage had to be exactly defined. There was a risk of the excited crowd pressing on to the ark, so near that no one could see the way. Therefore let the ark, high on the shoulders of its bearers, be two thousand cubits ahead so that all could see clearly the place of the crossing. Let *v.*^{17} finish the lesson: 'And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until all the people were passed clean over Jordan.'

Here then is a parable for us in our situation to-day. The ark carried by the priests signifies the guidance of God. So it was for the Israelites that day and to make the guidance effective there had to be a distance between. God as a guiding star is a favourite metaphor and just because a star is far away it is a good metaphor. A lantern would have helped the wise men as they crossed the stable yard but for guidance across the desert they had need of the star. For more than a generation the teaching of the church has sought to bring God near to men and women. It has been a great work and one has only to read the Sunday School lesson of to-day, to sing the

favourite children's hymns to realize how successfully that task has been accomplished. Whatever else our generation has done or failed to do, at least it has made real and living the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Has this been done at a price, have we begun to lose the sense of God's greatness and majesty? The two aspects are not opposed, nay rather they are complementary, indeed they are the same. The word 'glory' and all that is there implied, and 'the face of Jesus Christ,' the intimacy of that phrase, these truths are one and the same. To acknowledge that is to understand the distinctiveness, the supremacy of the Christian Faith. But it is difficult for the human to carry two opposite truths at one time with equal values. The pendulum swings from one extreme to the other. And in emphasizing God's nearness, has it been at the expense of that other fact, His transcendent majesty? Do we need the distance of two thousand cubits by measure just because we have not passed this way heretofore?

When Isaiah saw the Lord he thus described his experience: 'In the year that king Uzziah died I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up.' This coming year, at a crisis in the world's history that is precisely how we must see Him, we must think in terms of His Kingdom coming, of His Will to be done on earth as in heaven. Sweeping generalizations are always dangerous, but one is tempted to say that never has the idea of Emmanuel, God with us, been more stressed, never have we been so aware of the Christ near us, His spirit manifest in all kinds of good works; and never has there been such an ignoring of God as the Supreme Being. To see Him high and lifted up is humanity's need and hope. And we do not fear that the new emphasis will cost us this other precious truth of His nearness in Christ. On the contrary, the proclaiming of the majesty and greatness of God will bring new meaning, new life and power into the thought of His nearness. May we focus the whole argument on the thought of 'Worship' and pray that the New Year may see a revival of the spirit of worship in the church, among church members. It can begin with us; who dare say where it will end, that we may yet see a world acknowledging its Maker and finding Him once again to be its salvation. So we return to the story. Before us is the Jordan in flood, the waters of destruction that may engulf us, beyond is the Promised Land of our hopes and dreams. In worship and prayer we set God the Lord on high before us, to guide us safely through this year, for in very truth, we have not passed this way heretofore.

The Relevance of Theology.

By the Reverend John A. McFadden, B.D., Glasgow.

I.

When, in 1936, Canon Raven and in 1941, Professor Shaw of Canada, wrote articles pleading for the rehabilitation of the study of theology,[1] the 'queen of sciences,' it was just possible that so-called 'working' ministers would consider these pleadings of theological professors as something akin to *apologia pro vita sua*. For working ministers have their own thoughts about the 'queen of the sciences.' The gospel is their concern. Even in 1912, Dr. James Moffatt found it necessary to use up the first half-dozen pages of his book, *The Theology of the Gospels*, by way of apologizing for daring to use the words 'theology' and 'gospels' in the same breath. 'We verily thought the gospels were a refuge from theology.'[2]

There are not lacking signs that this rehabilitation has started. For instance, New Testament scholarship to-day has moved away from the 'Jesus of history' complex, being less concerned with disinterring Jesus of Nazareth from the debris of a primitive theology, than with seeking to understand the theology which finds its roots in the Jesus of history.

Whatever the reason—whether the breakdown of liberalism, or the invasion of a neo-orthodoxy from the Continent, or a genuine endeavour to revive theology as the *scientia scientiarum*—theology is once more forcing itself upon the working minister. It is no longer the concern of the specialist or professor. Theology has thrown off its archæological garments; dogma has freed itself from the show-cases of the museum. It is stirring to new life, compelling the most practical of us to rethink the implications of our message and our approach to men.

This claim may be considered over-optimistic by Divinity Hall professors and nonsense by those who are clamouring for an overhaul of the theological curriculum and a more up-to-date 'vocational training.' Others again, while recognizing there is a revival of interest in theology, may despair of the type of revival, and feel the challenge of the occasion as calling for 'a nailing of

[1] The Expository Times, xlviii. 19; liii. 143.
[2] Moffatt, *The Theology of the Gospels*, 1.

colours to the mast, the flaunting of a coat-tail in the face of theologians and philosophers, old and young.'[1] Other defenders of the faith, inspired by the fact that *facit indignatio versum*, may hasten to write against the 'hotch-potch of second-hand scraps from the Continent' and the new theology which dares to 'set theological over against historical exegisis.'[2]

Whatever the reaction to this claim on the part of curriculum reformers or British theology defenders, the reaction at least gives support to the claim. There may be too much theology or the wrong theology, but the hunger is there, and a healthy hunger at that. We can be sure that Kierkegaard is not indulged in as a mere fashionable picnic lunch. And even if the menu offers only 'a hotch-potch of second-hand scraps from the Continent,' this need not be cause for undue alarm. After all, there is little to choose from, in this food of the mind, as in present-day food for the body. If there are some who find reason for crying out against those who indulge in this menu, there must be others who are confident that, through this excess, a more stable diet will be discovered. The neophyte intensity with which the 'new' theology is being swallowed can lead to a healthier thinking and preaching, even after a bout of theological indigestion. Even the defenders of the 'old' must admit that it was by just such a process of trial and error that the 'old' came to be established. Heresy in a church may be a healthy sign, if the history of dogma teaches us anything at all.

Along with this revival of interest in theology, there is the plea that only when the theological significance of things is realized can there be any hope for a better state of affairs, politically, socially, and economically. There may be some truth in Barth's statement that 'if no one in the light of his own strength is capable of thinking theologically, none the less it may be said in the light of the object of theological thought (*i.e.* Jesus Christ) that verily no one must remain excluded from it.'[3] And not merely professional theologians would agree.

Whatever else we may think of the violent prejudices of such a writer as Sidney Dark, it is interesting to see that he traces the decay of Nonconformity in England to the loss of supernatural doctrine in its teaching and preaching. Dark adds, 'Religion must be supernatural and dogmatic if it is to have any attraction. "You need not believe very much" is a feeble appeal. Religion must never be apologetic.'[4] The same note is sounded by Maritain in his challenging essay, 'Who is my Neighbour?' There he has assured us that fellowship, which is a genuine 'friendship of charity' and not mere 'tolerance' is possible among Christians, 'despite the state of religious divisions in which mankind lives.' But he adds that 'it is wrong to say that such a friendship *transcends dogma* or exists *in spite* of the dogmas of faith. Such a view is inadmissible for all those who believe that the word of God is as absolute as His unity or His transcendence.' Later in the same essay, Maritain gives as his own personal conviction 'That a complete doctrine based on all principles of Catholic teaching is alone capable of supplying an entirely true solution for the problems of civilization.'[5]

In a similar strain, the editor of *The Catholic Herald*, in his attempt 'to face the problem of Christianity's practical failure to impress the contemporary world,' finds that 'the world does not want Christianity without dogma,'[6] while such an advocate for a new social and economic order as the Archbishop of Canterbury would presumably claim that we cannot have a new order of the type suggested in the Malvern Reports without doctrinal Christians. Still another would have us believe that 'the anxious children of the present will certainly not be attracted by a theology which minimizes or explains away the supernatural.'[7]

In recent years we have had a plethora of books professing to offer a diagnosis of our present chaos and discontent, with a superabundance of cures to boot. Now it would seem that theology is finding its place among the suggested panaceas. From the Thomist and Barthian to the recent writer who has suggested that even the question of the reform of theological curriculums is a theological issue,[8] theology in some form or other is being forced upon even the most practical of working ministers, and what is more, if the claims of writers referred to are justifiable, upon the most practical of ordinary men.

II.

Such a circumstance inevitably raises the old question about theology and life. What living contact has theology with life? Wherein lies the relevance of theology?

Middleton Murry has stated the ordinary man's impatience with 'abstract thinking' which has no living contact with life. 'I have almost,' he writes, 'a horror of abstraction, if it remains abstract. Somewhere, somehow, every abstract

[1] Hodgson, *Towards a Christian Philosophy*, 7.
[2] Raven, *The Good News of God*, 6.
[3] The Expository Times, xlix. 5.
[4] Dark, *I Sit, and I Think, and I Wonder*, 118.
[5] Maritain, *Redeeming the Time*, 109, 116.
[6] Michael de la Bedoyere, *Christianity in the Market Place*, 33.
[7] Casserley, *The Fate of Modern Culture*, 103.
[8] Ian Henderson, in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, xvi. 36.

thought must be capable of undergoing the test of living experience, of being tried out in the action or the attitude of the individual man. What I live by, or can live by, is the ultimate court of appeal.' [1]

Can a case be made out on behalf of theology's living contact with life? The answer is, of course, that theology has always had this living contact. It is true that particular presentations of theology have given the impression that theology is the most abstract of the abstract sciences, giving rise to the habit of studying theology as we might study archæology, with particular dogmas as the museum pieces. But Professors Raven and Shaw, in the articles already referred to, have no difficulty in showing that abstract theology is a debased theology.

The newest school of New Testament critics has made us familiar with the idea that a true understanding of any part of the Gospel records can only be reached when we consider its '*Sitz im Leben*,' which Dibelius has defined as 'place in the stream of life,' and 'the historical and social stratum in which precisely these literary forms were developed,' and again as 'sociological relationships.' [2] This valuable emphasis of '*Formgeschichte*' might profitably be applied to dogmas. For each element in the Creeds and doctrines of the Church did not arise *in vacuo*, but out of a definite situation in the life of the Church. The theological processes of thought behind the formulation of these elements were the result of 'debate,' which, however, was not indulged in for the mere love of argument.

A modern example of a theology growing out of a definite situation, or '*Sitz im Leben*,' is to be found in the emergence of the 'dialectical' theology in Germany. It has been maintained that in that country the 'liberal' theology of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was carried to its furthest lengths, 'and it is not surprising that it led to a violent swing of the pendulum. The change did not, of course, occur in the abstract as the result of unconditioned reflection on the part of theologians. The change was historically and sociologically conditioned to an extent which it is as yet too early to estimate.' (Vidler, *God's Judgment in Europe*, 64.)

Karl Barth himself has given us a more personal clue to the '*Sitz im Leben*' from which his theological outlook sprung. For twelve years, he tells us, he had a theology of a kind, but 'once in the ministry, I found myself growing away from these theological habits of thought and being forced back at every point more and more upon the specific *minister's* problem, the *sermon*. I sought to find my way between the problem of human life on the one hand and the content of the Bible on the other.' [3]

What Barth found in this very personal way the Church also found, and still finds, throughout its history. Its Creeds and Doctrines do not arise *in vacuo*, as the playthings of students. They are the very life-blood of the Church. Theology, then, we may in all seriousness claim, arises out of life itself, and has a living contact with the ordinary affairs of men. Christian doctrine is the result of 'trafficking in the commerce of human thought.' Urgent preaching, then, demands urgent theology.

III.

But the relevance of theology goes deeper than a living contact with life. After all, theology begins with *theou logos*, and not with the 'modern mind.' It is now being realized that liberalism in theological thought has broken down just because of its tolerant attempt to accommodate itself to the 'modern outlook.' This disintegration of the one-time self-confident and aggressive liberalism is forcing the Church to seek the relevance of its theology in something other than the modern spirit. Theology must be relevant with itself and with its source.

The still prevalent idea of teacher and inquirer 'starting from scratch,' from a common basis of knowledge, can be disastrous for theology. The 'modern mind' is not the starting-point, the standard of judgment, for theology. It is rather ὁ περὶ θεοῦ λόγος.

We have seen that as a matter of historical truth, the dogmas of the Christian faith are the thought-out and hammered-out answers to burning questions. That is, the questions came before the credal and doctrinal answers. But even before the questions were asked, there was the challenge which prompted the questions. The content of that challenge was, and still is, the content of the Christian message. And it is just here that theology must begin. It begins with its mind made up, not in any bigoted sense, but because its mind has been made up for it. The presuppositions of theology are 'given.'

In his second part of *Church Dogmatics*, not yet given to English readers, Barth declares that Dogmatics is a function both of the 'hearing' and the 'teaching' Church. 'It calls the teaching Church to a new hearing of the Word of God, the revelation to which the Bible witnesses. That it can only do as, for its part, it takes the place of the hearing Church and itself obeys the Word of God as the norm to which the hearing Church knows itself to be subordinate.' [4]

[1] Middleton Murry, *Things to Come*, p. viii.
[2] Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 6, 7, 10.
[3] Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, 100.
[4] Quoted in article by Sydney Cave in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlix. 379.

F. R. Tennant has shown that faith as 'a kind of exploratory venture into the realm of the hoped for and as yet unknown' is something quite different from belief in the Christian revelation, which belief he defines as 'intellectual assent to propositions already established.' 'It (*i.e.* belief in the Christian revelation) is acceptance of what is offered as truth beyond the reach of the individual, and save that it involves *trust* in witnesses, interpreters, etc., is otherwise nothing more than assent to truth claims.' [1]

This 'truth beyond the reach of the individual' may be identified with the challenge which prompts the questions, and which ultimately shapes and colours the answers. While some may feel that Dr. Tennant puts the matter too low when he claims that to accept this 'is otherwise nothing more than assent to truth claims'—and 'existential' theologians would claim that something more than 'assent' was required—there is a very real sense in which the content of the Christian revelation is 'given,' and as such is unaffected by the acceptance or rejection of man, or by the standards and presuppositions of the 'modern mind.' Theology must be primarily relevant to this 'given,' and in its effort to answer the questions of men, it begins with the Word of God.

There is no suggestion here that theology is entirely free from using the thought forms of the 'modern mind.' In its trafficking in the commerce of human thought, theology must ever be seeking to extend its area of inquiry. It is false to imagine that God has given a final revelation in all matters pertaining to human life. 'Even the moral code of the Decalogue calls for supplement or for completely transforming interpretation before it will correspond with what we know of the will of God for ourselves.' [2]

But this does not mean that theology must 'compromise' with the presuppositions of the modern mind. It merely emphasizes what has already been implied in the idea of theology having a definite '*Sitz im Leben*.' Credal and doctrinal statements must be understandable of the people, certainly. But the people must ask the proper questions before these can be fully understood.

It is in this sense that we must understand the Anselmic 'rationalism.' As befitted a keen student of Augustine's works, Anselm affirmed his standpoint in the words, *necque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam*,[3] echoing the words of Augustine, *credimus ut cognoscamus*. For Anselm, the truth of the Catholic doctrines was based upon their being divinely revealed, and as such can only be accepted on the authority of the Church. But divine revelation did not preclude the use of reason towards the understanding of these doctrines. Anselm, like the real theologian, while not despising the use of reason, begins with the 'given': *quia credimus, rationem quaerimus*. He rationalizes, *i.e.* uses the 'modern' thought forms, as his questioner, Boso, himself admits, *non ut me in fides confirmes*,[4] but to establish one already in the faith, and to increase his joy in that faith.

Theology does not quarrel with reason, but in seeking the theological significance of things must begin with the 'given,' the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Herein lies the true relevance of theology.

IV.

To sum up, then. The relevance of theology does not lie in its up-to-dateness. To current thought and action the gospel will always be 'scandalous' and 'offensive,' and a theology which derives from the 'given' of the gospel has little chance of accommodating itself to the 'modern outlook.' The need for to-day would seem to be, not so much a theology which thinks men's thoughts after them, setting an ecclesiastical *imprimatur* upon the latest findings of science and philosophy. The Apostolic seal upon the Christian message was not *nemine contradicente*, but τὸ σκάνδαλον and τὸ μωρόν. Theology does not seek to speak the thoughts of man in out-of-date language, but to present the Word of God to man, even in language which may seem 'scandalous' and 'offensive.'

The theologian's real anxiety to-day should be, less how to reinterpret the psychological, scientific, or philosophical findings in archaic ecclesiastical jargon, than how to make explicit what is already implicit in the Divine Act in Jesus Christ. For the relevance of theology is bound up with its relevance to that Divine Act.

Each 'article' in creed or dogma must be stated in terms of that Divine Act. Any restatement of creed or dogma, then, must be more with a view to bringing each particular element into line with this Divine Act, and not so much with bringing it into line with the modern outlook. The revelation of God in Jesus Christ is the standard by which creeds or dogmas stand or fall, not with the discoveries of Freud or Pavlov, Jeans or Eddington.

Belief in the Resurrection begins, not with what the modern knights of the Round Table, Sir Wm. Brooke, Sir Oliver Lodge, and Sir Wm. Barrett, have discovered in their quest of the 'spiritist phenomena,' but with what we believe regarding the Living God. We do not justify the Doctrine of the Atonement before the bar of the psycho-

[1] Tennant, *The Nature of Belief*, 102.
[2] Temple, *Nature, Man, and God*, 324 f.
[3] *Proslogion*, I.
[4] *Cur Deus Homo*, i. 2; ii. 15.

analyst, but we proclaim forgiveness on the authority of the Cross. The reason for the existence of the Church is not to be found in the 'herd instinct,' the 'group mind,' or the 'general will,' but in the Incarnation.

Brunner never wearies in reminding us that 'through God alone can God be known.' 'No one,' he writes, 'ought to object to this; on the contrary, all language of Christian theology presupposes the knowledge of this basic fact of revelation; if this were not the case its terminology would be that of the general philosophy of religion. Christian theology cannot be built up gradually, line upon line, any more than the Christian creed has been composed of isolated clauses. Christian knowledge is not a mechanical structure, composed of separate pieces; it is an organism in which the whole precedes the parts, that is to say, the whole is already contained in each part. Thus each article of faith, each theological idea can only issue from the whole and return to the whole, just as the circulation of the blood starts from the heart and returns to it again.' [1]

It would appear, then, that the need—if not the sole need, then certainly the primary need—of theology to-day is to find its true relevance with the Living God. Maritain draws attention to 'the illusion of seeking for the basis and purpose of good fellowship in a common minimum of doctrinal identity—a common minimum which would seem gradually to shrink to nothing while we discussed it, like the wild ass's skin in Balzac's story.' [2]

This is important in any ecumenical discussion for union among the Christian churches. The aim of such conferences should not be to find the least common denominator of what is believed by all, but a reinvestigation of the real riches of our most holy faith.

[1] Brunner, *The Mediator*, 202.
[2] Maritain, *op. cit.*, 115.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The raising of the screen of war that has for so long shut us off from the Continent of Europe is now permitting us to become acquainted with scholarly work that has been carried on there during the war years. To secure access to many of the works that have appeared may take a long time, if they are ever available to us here, as editions in some cases were small, and many of the leading continental publishers and booksellers had their stocks destroyed. From the Scandinavian countries some copies of publications issued there are now beginning to come through, and in several cases they were written in the English language. From Professor Johannes Pedersen comes the welcome news that his *Israel III-IV* appeared in an English translation in 1940, and many readers will share the writer's eagerness to see a copy.

The Ezra Narrative. It is interesting to find that in Norway, under German occupation, publications were allowed to appear in English, and the writer is informed by one Norwegian scholar that there was a noticeable tendency to use English increasingly for such works. One such work is by Arvid S. Kapelrud,[1] a disciple of Sigmund Mowinckel, who devotes his work to a lexical study of 'The Ezra Narrative.' By this the author means Ezra 7–10 and Nehemiah 8, to which he limits his study. His method is to study the words and phrases in the order of the text in their affinities with other passages in the Old Testament. He is little concerned with wider questions of philology, but primarily interested in learning what he can from the language and style of the author or authors of these chapters. Part is written in the first person and part in the third, and he demonstrates that there are no stylistic differences between these sections, and none between them and the composition of the Chronicler. He therefore holds that no part can be regarded as genuine Ezra memoirs, but that the whole must be attributed to the Chronicler. At the close of his work he indicates that he does not regard the Chronicler as an individual, but rather as 'a whole circle or more probably groups of circles that have grown up in a definite Levite-influenced milieu in Jerusalem.' Dr. Kapelrud does not follow the way of Torrey, however, and dissolve Ezra into the fictitious creation of the Chronicler. He finds evidences in Nehemiah 8 of an older core of tradition that the Chronicler employed, and while he finds it impossible to delimit this, it suffices to carry the tradition back beyond the Chronicler's own time.

Within the range of his restricted interest Dr. Kapelrud's work is excellently done. On wider questions, both philological and historical, he shows a tendency to pass a judgment without offering the reader any adequate discussion of the matters at issue. He rejects the view that the different spellings of the name Artaxerxes in Ezra-Nehemiah are intended to distinguish different kings of that name, though he adopts the now common view that the name of Nehemiah is not original to the text of Nehemiah 8, and that Ezra should be assigned to the period of Artaxerxes II. His discussions of these historical questions could have been expanded with advantage. At more than one point he expresses disagreement with the theories of Schaeder as to the significance of

[1] *The Question of Authorship in the Ezra-Narrative* (1944). Dybwad, Oslo. Kr. 7.00.

Ezra's title of *Sofer* and of the problematical word *meforash* in Neh 8^{8}. Schaeder held that the former was an official title, while the latter means 'translated.' A fuller examination of Schaeder's arguments would have avoided the appearance of a rather facile rejection, and would probably have strengthened the case for rejection.

Dr. Kapelrud finds some Jewish colouring, and evidences of acquaintance with other Jewish writings, in the Aramaic document preserved in Ezr 7^{12-26}, and has no difficulty in rejecting its authenticity as an official document. The mere statement of Eduard Meyer's view that Ezra may have actually drawn up the rescript is treated as its sufficient refutation. Yet here again many questions are involved that demand more than this summary treatment. The so-called Passover papyrus from Elephantine is sufficient evidence that Persian official authority could be given to an order for Jewish religious celebrations, and Meyer's view can to-day claim more show of probability than when he wrote it. But without attempting any specific identification of the writer, and allowing Kapelrud's contention that the hand of the Chronicler can be discerned in the document, there still remains the possibility that he worked with existing materials as much here as in Nehemiah 8, and that a substantial authentic core is preserved in the document.

Practically the whole of Dr. Kapelrud's book is devoted to careful study of words and phrases, and it is here that the solid value of his work is to be found. To this exacting task he has brought patience and skill. As in so many modern books all Hebrew words appear in transliteration, presumably to reduce the costs of printing. The work is admirably printed, and despite an occasional solecism the English is excellent.

The **Ras Shamra texts** continue, and are likely for long to continue, to be much discussed. The Belgian scholar R. de Langhe, who published in 1939 an important study of the contribution of these texts to the history of Israelite origins,[1] issued in 1942 a short examination of the evidence for the alleged recognition of Yahweh amongst the deities of Ras Shamra.[2] As long ago as 1932 Virolleaud signified that he had found a god Yw mentioned in a text, and this was hailed by a number of writers, even before the text was first published in 1938, as evidence that Yahweh figured in the pantheon of Ras Shamra. Since the publication of the text, it has been supposed by Dussaud [3] that Yw was the son of El and Elat, and that what Moses did for Israel was to elevate Yw to be its god, to the displacement of El, his father. J. N. Schofield, while recognizing in a footnote that Albright rejects the alleged discovery of Yahweh in this text,[4] himself so far accepts it as to publish a picture of a Ras Shamra god, which he says may possibly be Yahweh.[5] So far as the present writer knows, there is not the slightest evidence to connect this picture with the doubtful Yw, who figures nowhere else in the published texts from Ras Shamra, and who was, at best, so minor a figure there that it is highly improbable that he was the object of the royal worship on this bas-relief.

In the present study de Langhe examines with care the slender basis on which this whole structure rests. He shows that it stands in a context where about half of each line is lost, and it is always precarious to build far-reaching theories on a few words in a broken context. Virolleaud reads the words *šm.bny.yw.elt* and renders 'The name of my son is Yw,' without determining how *elt* is to be related to the words that precede. Dussaud supposes that El here says 'The name of my son is Yw the son of Elat.' De Langhe shows that the suppression of *bn* here is without parallel in the Ras Shamra texts, and that it would be equally difficult to take *yw.elt* as a compound divine name. Compound divine names are found at Ras Shamra, but nothing of this order. The conclusion is therefore drawn that no solid evidence has yet been adduced for the inclusion of Yw amongst the deities of Ras Shamra. Some other scholars had already reached this conclusion, including Albright, who disputes the very reading on which the whole theory rests, and who reads *yr* instead of *yw*. But de Langhe's full and careful study, marked by exact scholarship and sober judgment, has greatly reinforced them, and should check the ready ascription to the people of Ugarit of the worship of Yahweh.

For the rectorial address at the opening of the session at the Swiss University of Fribourg in 1942, M. A. Van den Oudenrijn chose the subject of **the Lachish Excavations** and Old Testament study.[6] The address surveys all that is known of Lachish from archæological sources, and in particular treats of the Lachish Letters in their relation to the Old Testament. In the course of the address there is no original contribution to their study, for such would hardly be expected on such an occasion, but there is a very useful summary of information by a competent scholar, and in the notes at the end of the volume there are some discussions of particular points.

Van den Oudenrijn rejects Torczyner's claim to have discovered the prophet Uriah in the letters,[7] but pronounces the view of Dussaud and Jack that the mutilated name of Jeremiah stands here possible, but difficult to prove. Others would go further, and say improbable, and quite impossible to prove.

It has been widely noted that the common

[1] *Les textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs apports á l'histoire des origines Israélites* (1939).

[2] *Un dieu Yahweh à Ras Shamra?* Bibeljsch Seminarie, Louvain (1942). (Bulletin d'histoire et d'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament, Fasc. 14.)

[3] In a paper still inaccessible here: 'Yahwé,' in *Comtes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* (1940), p. 369 f.

[4] *The Religious Background of the Bible* (1944), p. 281, note 19.

[5] *Ibid.*, facing p. 25.

[6] *Les fouilles de Lākîš et l'étude de l'Ancien Testament.* Librairie de l'Université, Fribourg en Suisse (1942).

[7] *The Lachish Letters* (Lachish I), p. 16.

textual accident of haplography is represented in the letters. Van den Oudenrijn thinks that in the expression חיהוה for חי יהוה this is deliberate. He would therefore seem to agree with what Torczyner wrote in 1938: 'Such cases of haplography, however, may not always be mistakes, but an actual rendering of the popular pronunciation of these words, exactly as we abbreviate in writing and in pronunciation word-compositions like "don't" for "do not" and so on.' Torczyner himself has recently indignantly repudiated this view, and taxed Orlinsky with unfairness in remembering that he had written it.[1] It is therefore clear that the evidence for deliberate abbreviation is slight, and it is better to find the accidental slip of a scribe.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[1] Cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxiv. (1945), pp. 399–402.

Contributions and Comments.

Zoological Hebrew.

Of course the translation 'young lion' for כפיר is accurate, but it is misleading, for there are many texts in which 'young lion' gives the ordinary reader the idea of a cub, which is quite wrong. The כפיר is a very definite creature. In a fight it is about as formidable as another lion, but it is distinguishable at sight from another lion. Clearly, it is the male which has grown to full dimensions but has not yet grown its mane. This, I understand, means a lion two years old. If the creature had existed on the American frontier, the American pioneer would certainly have called it a two-year-old lion unless, as would have been likely enough, he had coined a name for it by prefixing some arbitrary and quite unpredictable adjective to 'lion.' In the story of Samson we ought to translate 'two-year-old lion,' and similarly 'two-year-old' wherever the point of view is that of the ranchman or the hunter, sometimes even in poetry; but in passages of poetry where the numeral would seem unduly mathematical, we may have to content ourselves with 'young lion' still.

Some of the newest German commentaries are acting as if it were nearly enough a settled thing that פרא means zebra. This is certainly wrong; not necessarily because פרא is to this day the Arabic word for the Syrian wild ass, though that is a good enough argument to stand firm until confuted; perhaps not necessarily because it would be amazing that the zebra should be mentioned so many times by different writers with never a word of its stripes, though that is a very strong argument indeed; but most certainly because all that we hear of the פרא is in allusion to its habits of life, and this implies that it led its life within the Hebrew's sphere of observation. No creature which was known only by the reports of far-ranging travellers or as a curiosity brought for exhibition could be talked of as the פרא is everywhere talked of. The zebra simply lives too far away. There are zebras in Somaliland. Ridgeway's *Origin and Influence of the Thoroughbred Horse* in its chapter on the Equidae cites the testimony of Masudi, about A.D. 950, that somewhere about Nubia (in the Oasis of Kharga, Ridgeway argues) there were at that time small wild asses striped black and white. Ridgeway is also willing to see zebras in Herodotus's statement that in the Sahara near Tunis, but not in the adjacent territory habitable to man, there are non-drinking asses; but really this is no testimony to zebras, for, first, the locality is practically as near to the native home of the ass as to that of the zebra; secondly, if Herodotus or his informant had been describing zebras for the benefit of those who did not know the creature he would infallibly have mentioned the stripes as Masudi does; thirdly, the wild ass is known as a desert beast, but stripes are biologically the appropriate coat of a jungle beast and are incongruous to a desert beast. But be that as it may: if Solomon's sailors had landed in Somaliland and seen a herd of zebras there, if some Hebrew had gone to Upper Egypt on business and had seen zebras in the Great Oasis, if some second Jonah had embarked on a ship of Tarshish and wandered in the neighbourhood of Carthage till he saw a zebra even there, if wild-beast fanciers had brought zebras for exhibition at the court of every king of Jerusalem from Solomon to the Maccabees, all this combined would not have made it possible to talk of the zebra in the way in which the פרא is talked of. Finally, the פרא is characteristically a solitary creature (Gn 16^{12}, Hos 8^{9}, also Jer 2^{24}), but zebras live in herds.

Dictionaries give the impression that סוס and פרש are the same creature and are distinguished only as to the purpose for which they are used. The first paragraphs of the article 'Cavalry' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition, may teach us better. It is true that the Britannica writer has read his Ridgeway with the utmost carelessness (even the word 'reliefs' is a misreading of 'relics'; the relics were painted, not carved) and that Ridgeway does not support any one of the particulars which are given as taken from him; perhaps it is for this reason, and not merely because of the generally abridged character of the fourteenth edition, that the fourteenth edition omits the matter in question. Nevertheless, it strikes me that as a historian of the use of horses in war this writer knows what he is talking about. The reason why horses were at first used in war for chariots and not to carry riders is because those horses were ponies not fit

to carry riders (especially armoured riders) into battle. Cavalry began when the battlefield received horses capable of carrying a man under service conditions. Different types of horses and ponies were formerly much more distinct from each other than is commonly the case now, and the general tendency of breeding has been to change the smaller ponies to larger horses; for both these facts see Ridgeway *passim*. In Hebrew, then, סוּס is 'pony,' the creature too small for cavalry but useful in chariots, and פָּרָשׁ is 'horse,' the creature of cavalry size, just as in Arabic to-day the Arab's thoroughbred and the low-grade horse of the outside world are not called by the same name.

But the recognition of this fact raises the question of the רֹכֵב סוּס. Does this phrase mean a chariot-rider, called רכב סוס because רכב רכב would neither look right nor sound right, or is it a pony-rider sitting on the pony's back? for a man can ride a pony, even if not for cavalry fighting. I think that in this phrase we have the rider on the pony's back. An unarmed messenger, as in 2 K $9^{18.19}$, can ride on a pony; and texts like Gn 49^{17} and 2 K 18^{23} seem to call for this conception.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

Ballard Vale, Mass., U.S.A.

Universals and Particulars in the Sermon on the Mount.

No sooner had the ancient persecutions of the Church ceased and Christians themselves came to have responsibility of government than certain passages in the Sermon on the Mount began to plague their minds and consciences (Mt 5^{25-26} 5^{39} and Lk 6^{29}, Mt 5^{38-42} and Lk 6^{29-30}). Emperor Julian, the Apostate, condemned these teachings as utterly fantastic and subversive of law and order. Prince Volucianus in desperation appealed through a mutual friend to the Great Bishop of Hippo.

A study of the history of the interpretation of these passages reveals the fact that Augustine, Gregory the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Richard Baxter, John Wesley, and doubtless many others whose works have not been studied in this connexion, have wrestled rather hopelessly with these teachings of Jesus. John Calvin roundly condemned those who undertook to practise the religious anarchy and the pacifism which these passages seemed to imply.

The great thinkers of the Church mentioned above, to a man, added many reservations, limitations, and qualifications, with many 'buts' and 'and yets.' They express confidence that Jesus could not have meant that we should hand over our property rather than go to court; that He would not have prepared the way for robbery and extortion, or have whetted the lust of those greedy for the property of their neighbours; that He did not open the way for ruffians to abuse innocent citizens. In substance the commentators deny the plain implications of the passages without giving sufficient exegetical reasons for doing so. They resorted to general principles and common sense. They say that Jesus could not have meant what He is reported clearly to have taught.

Modern commentators follow the lead of the older ones with the exception of those who take the apocalyptic view with their 'interim ethic,' and those who simply say that times have changed and these teachings do not apply. By this last criterion the Ten Commandments would seem to be still further out of date. (For a fuller history of the interpretation of these passages see my article 'The Magna Charta of the Christian Life' in the summer [1945] number of *Christendom*.)

The practical difficulties of these passages are resolved, and a perfectly simple and natural meaning appears if we link these instructions, as Jesus did, with the persecutions to which He called attention repeatedly. The Sermon on the Mount is a collection of sayings of Jesus uttered at various times and places; but we are suggesting that the teachings under discussion were instructions to the disciples how to conduct themselves under persecution or when in an extremely hostile environment. Such tactics have been resorted to many times by missionaries, foreign travellers, by persons in a war zone, or by members of minority groups, victims of popular uprisings. However, these instructions are not merely wise instructions how to meet a difficult situation. Underneath these particular instructions is to be noted the universal spirit of love and devoted service so characteristic of Jesus' teachings and conduct.

Jesus carefully associated these instructions with the persecutions to which He repeatedly warned His disciples that they would be subjected. To separate what Jesus has joined together, and make universals out of particulars, is to do Jesus a serious injustice and mislead some of His most devoted followers.

G. T. TOLSON.

Berkeley, California.

Entre Nous.

The Iona Community.

In this interesting booklet, *We Shall Rebuild:* The Work of the Iona Community on Mainland and on Island, by the Rev. George MacLeod, M.C., D.D. (The Iona Community, 4 Park Circus Place, Glasgow: 2s. 6d. net), Dr. MacLeod has stated clearly the purpose of the movement of which he is the begetter. He has done a great deal more. He has discussed the condition of the

modern Church, and especially his own Church, the Church of Scotland, exposed the inadequacy of present methods of evangelism, made constructive proposals for a new approach to the three-fourths of the Scottish people who have no vital link with organized Christianity, emphasized the community character of this approach and indeed the social character of conversion, and laid down a Rule for the Community, somewhat stringent for members, tempered with mercy for 'associates,' and generally suffused all the hundred and forty pages of this book with an attractive spirit of adventure. There is a theology behind it all, with two foci, the Incarnation and the Priesthood of all believers. I have been impressed, as everybody who reads these pages will be, by the deep earnestness, the courage, and the intelligence that have gone to the shaping of this movement.

'The Iona Community is a body of men within the Church of Scotland, married and unmarried, clerical and lay, brought together by their common instinct—that the special challenge of the twentieth century to the Church is that she declare again the centrality of the Faith to life in all its aspects [the Incarnation is as much concerned with babies born in vile conditions to-day as with the Babe born in Bethlehem]: that they themselves are failing to witness to such a Faith partly through their own indiscipline and partly through what appears to them inadequate emphasis in the way the Faith has been presented to them, and is still being presented, in the theology, the modes of worship and the standards of Fellowship within their own communion; recognizing that such inadequacies are not matters for superficial criticism of their contemporaries, but are a cumulative error of vision and a consequent disobedience for which we must all share the blame.' That is how Dr. MacLeod describes the nature of the Community. Its purpose is to realize the implications of the Incarnation in modern social life, to recover the ancient tradition of the Scottish Church, and to this end to experiment in modes of worship and in the emphasis on Fellowship, for the renewal of the ideal of Christ's Church.

If this sounds a little vague it should be said that the vagueness is dissipated by the directness with which the present-day Church's methods are criticised and also by the definiteness of the proposals for a new social approach to the problem of 'mission.' The chief mark of the criticism is the Parish System which has largely broken down. It is disturbing that ninety per cent. of our home clergy are still almost entirely concerned with the pastorate, *i.e.* with the shepherding of the twenty-five per cent. already gathered in, while only ten per cent. are seriously tackling the problem of mission. And for the most part it is the ablest men who are sent to the 'soft' places. Also in Parish A, a 'down-town' concern, the minister is engaged teaching the children of people who resided once in his parish but are now in Parish B, miles away. But if that is the chief target, there are others—the training of ministers, and the old revivalist methods, for example.

The Iona constructive ideas are quite as definite. Perhaps the main idea is that the Church should turn round. In Liverpool, Dr. MacLeod says, there was a Parish Church which had its back to the river and the market-place. It was blitzed, and within its ancient walls an imaginative rector has built another church, smaller and modern but with its front to river and market! This is the parable that Dr. MacLeod works out in detail. It includes a reform of worship, a complete renewal of approach to the problem of the churchless three-fourths, and a community life with a rule which includes definite times for prayer and Bible reading, and an economic demand on members for a standard of spending money. To go into detail would be impossible here, but what I have said (with deep sympathy and understanding) will at least point the way to the book itself, which has been written, at least in part, as an appeal for new members, particularly among the younger ministers and the lay craftsmen. One thing should certainly be added. It is a mistake to imagine that the Iona Community spends its days in a kind of religious picnic on the island. Three months are devoted to Iona where the members enjoy fellowship in labour (rebuilding the Abbey) and in study and discussion. This is their training. But nine months are spent in the city applying this training, and the ideals of the community, to the problems of the city.

F. J. RAE.

End of Christendom.

'For centuries past Britain has belonged to a recognizable Christendom. "Christendom" is not the description of an ideal state, but of an accepted ideal. Our real crisis is that the ideal is no longer generally accepted. When we had Christendom, though there were dark corners in the Chancellories of Europe, men could at least be certain that war would be declared under recognized rules. . . . When we had Christendom —in more domestic aspect—there might be even darker corners in our social achievements, but there was a general Christian standard in the matter of right and wrong and in such matters as the ownership of bits of property. There was never a time when all Scotland went to Church, but there was a time when practically all Scotland knew the Shorter Catechism. If the generality of Scotsmen never succeeded in all being in Church on one Sunday, the generality knew what the chief end of man was . . . that was Christendom . . . men might curse Sabbatarianism, but there was a Sabbatarianism to curse. . . . To sharpen the point to a fine particular, the soap and towels in a corridor carriage remained, by universal consent, the property of the railway company. That was Christendom. It is much more than that particular piece of soap and that small towel that has gone. What has gone is the general consensus of opinion among rich and poor that it should "naturally" remain there. All the way

up from such small instances, truth and mutual respect are recognizably disappearing.' [1]

An Inspiring Book.

'This is one of the few books which every one without exception should read.' That is the first sentence of Bishop Neill's review in the 'Spectator' of *They Found the Church There*, by the Rev. Henry P. Van Dusen, D.D., (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The sub-title of the book is 'The Armed Forces Discover Christian Missions in the Pacific.' But the story the book tells is really the story of a great romance—the Christianizing of the islands of the South Pacific, of the heroism of the pioneer missionaries, many of whom were killed by the head-hunters and cannibals, and not of the missionaries' heroism only but the incredible heroism of their converts and of the building up of a Christian civilization out of the bestiality and cruelty of a primitive people. The best review of this book is to tell one of its stories.

It is about an island Lua Nina. It was found impossible to land on it because of the hostility of the natives. Two native Christians volunteered to remain and face the danger, almost the certainty, of death. The missionary was most unwilling to allow them and represented all the perils and hardships in the way. The two native Christians answered: 'Sir, if you will take our wives and families back to the Solomons with you and care for them, we are willing to remain and do our best to win Lua Nina for Christ. We have considered all the risks, but we have also considered what Christ has done for us. If it is God's will that these things should come to us, our lives are His.' Hardships, hunger, threats of death did come to them. But in the end their patience and faith prevailed, and Lua Nina had a mission station that has won the island to a profession of Christianity.

Is it any wonder that the armed forces of Britain and America, finding this kind of Christianity in the islands everywhere should have conceived a profound admiration for missions? Over and over again soldiers and airmen have been rescued, cared for and served, often at great risk, by the native Christians. And their letters home have been expanded versions of this one: 'Dear Mom, Because of missions I was feasted and not feasted upon when I fell from the sky into this village.' The soldiers so treated have in many cases raised generous sums for the mission work as a token of their gratitude.

Incidentally there is a great deal of interesting information about the geography and history of these lands. But the book is a priceless revelation of the victory of truth and goodness over the vile evils that once held sway in the Pacific, and a triumphant witness to the imperial mission of the Christian Church.

Influence.

In sending an article to *World Dominion* on 'Medical Work in New Guinea' Constance Fairhall says: 'The natives of Papua—that south-eastern part of New Guinea—have been in touch with civilization for just seventy years this year. Dr. Lawes was the first white man to live in Papua. Three years later the British Government sent a representative. Throughout the years Papua has had three very fine Administrators—Sir William MacDonald, Sir George de Huite, and Sir Hubert Murray (brother of Professor Gilbert Murray). There has been no exploitation in Papua. The Government's policy has been the development of the country with and by—and for the benefit of—the natives. *All* educational, and a great deal of the medical, work has been in the hands of the missionaries, with grants from the Government, throughout these years. Government and Missions have always worked side by side in Papua. To-day, we are seeing the grand results of the work of Government and Missions combined.'

A striking illustration of the great results of the work is given at the end of the article. 'Forty-four years ago,' she says, 'the Goariberi natives of the west killed and ate James Chalmers and Oliver Tomkins of the London Missionary Society. The natives of New Guinea were known to be savage and cruel. To-day, they have become almost world-famous as stretcher-bearers over the Owen Stanley ranges and are called the "Fuzzy-Wuzzy Angels" by the Australian soldiers. I submit that it is not civilization alone that is responsible for this change from savages to angels. As one soldier writes:

'Here's to you Fuzzy-Wuzzy, savage man of tender heart,
We the fighters, we the wounded—we have seen you play a part
That will ever be remembered when the warrior tales are told,
How you showed us in New Guinea something finer than its gold.'

Bridges.

A letter written by Pastor von Bodelschwingh, the Head of the Bethel Mission at Bielefeld, has been published in *The Manchester Guardian* and we quote the last paragraph—'Wherever, in the different circles of the Church, men and women meet to talk about starting their work again they should first gather in quiet under the word of God and place the past under His forgiveness and the future in His light. Thus there could be built bridges of truth and love over many chasms which have separated us up till the present. Clarity and unity would be given us about the next steps to be taken.'

---

[1] G. MacLeod, *We Shall Rebuild*.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.